

Also, memorial of the House of Representatives, State of Texas, urging manufacture of nitrogen at the Muscle Shoals plant; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEERS: A bill (H. R. 2830) granting an increase of pension to Ellen C. Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLACKBURN: A bill (H. R. 2831) for the relief of Jasper Johnson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 2832) granting an increase of pension to Emilia Gulentz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 2833) granting a pension to Lucy J. Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2834) granting a pension to Sella Wheeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLAGUE: A bill (H. R. 2835) granting a pension to Emma Burns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARKE of New York: A bill (H. R. 2836) granting an increase of pension to Nellie Coss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD (by request): A bill (H. R. 2837) to authorize the appointment of Lillian Schaeufele, quartermaster clerk, as warrant officer, United States Army, and retirement as such; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOUSTON of Delaware: A bill (H. R. 2838) for the relief of George E. Megee; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2839) granting an increase of pension to Lucy E. Gettig; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2840) for the relief of Harry C. Saxton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENDALL of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 2841) granting an increase of pension to Hannah W. Davenport; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 2842) granting a pension to Polly Billiter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 2843) to authorize Brig. Gen. William S. Thayer, Medical Reserve Corps, and Col. William H. Welch, Medical Reserve Corps, to accept such decorations, orders, and medals as have been tendered them by foreign governments in appreciation of services rendered; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUCE: A bill (H. R. 2844) granting a pension to John F. Chickey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCCLINTOCK of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 2845) granting a pension to Effie Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2846) granting a pension to Mary D. Biery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2847) granting a pension to Margaret Frizzell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MENGES: A bill (H. R. 2848) granting an increase of pension to Ida M. Bayler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 2849) for the relief of Lowell Oakland Co.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 2850) for the relief of the Farmers & Merchants National Bank, of Gilmer, Tex.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TEMPLE: A bill (H. R. 2851) granting a pension to Harriett J. Behanna; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 2852) granting a pension to Estelle Eby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2853) granting an increase of pension to Mary Jane Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

361. By Mr. BAIRD: Memorial of Wooster-Boalt Woman's Relief Corps, No. 143, Norwalk, Ohio, Matilda R. Taylor, president, favoring increase in pensions for Civil War veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

362. Also, memorial of Central Dairy Producers' Council, of Dayton, Ohio, requesting amendment of the proposed tariff bill to give full rates to dairy products and oils and fats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

363. Also, memorial of Cargo Camp, No. 109, United Spanish War Veterans, Bowling Green, Ohio, by Thomas M. Lea, adjutant, requesting action on the Knutson bill, for additional pensions for Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

364. By Mr. HASTINGS: Petition of sundry citizens of Okmulgee County, Okla., favoring pension legislation for the benefit

of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Pensions.

365. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of the Big Six Post, No. 1522, Veterans of Foreign Wars, favoring the repeal of the Jones prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

366. By Mr. O'CONNOR of New York: Resolutions of the Big Six Post, No. 1522, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, protesting against the eighteenth amendment and enacting laws and demanding their repeal and the annulment of the Jones law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

367. By Mr. PEAVER: Petition of directors of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, regarding tariff legislation on various farm products adopted by the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Association through the Milltown Cooperative Creamery Co., of Milltown, Wis.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

368. By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: Petition of J. H. Boles and Clint Boles, of Larue, Tex., and of N. U. Wilson, of Athens, Tex., to Congress for a separate bill to increase tariff duties on competing farm products immediately; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

369. By Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts: Memorial of Massachusetts State Senate, May 9, 1929: "Whereas it appears that the tariff revision bill as reported by the Ways and Means Committee of the Congress of the United States on May 7 fails to accord to the shoe and leather industries of this Commonwealth any tariff protection notwithstanding the fact that these important industries are keenly suffering from the handicap of competition resulting from European standards of wages and of living, thus placing in serious jeopardy the welfare of these major industries; and whereas it is highly essential that Massachusetts wage earners should receive the same degree of tariff protection against the influx of foreign products that is accorded other lines of industry: Therefore be it ordered that the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully represent to Congress and the President of the United States the necessity of amending said tariff bill in order that said industries be preserved and the American standard of living for the workers engaged therein be maintained; and be it further ordered, that copies of this order be forwarded forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of both branches of Congress, and to the Members thereof, representing this Commonwealth"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, May 11, 1929

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, the blessings of life are countless. Its cup is so full that we know not where to begin to praise Thy holy name. To-day the tides of our thought are shifting and the shadows of the past are lifted. We muse in our hearts of mother. No sculptor ever wrought with master touch a fairer face. O God, it is rapture to think of her measureless love. Her footstool was our first altar; her worn hand guided our faltering footsteps. When the day was done and the toil was through, oh, brighter the skies, smoother the paths, and sweeter the rest because of mother. Do Thou always enable us to honor her station and prove her high estate. To-day her holy sacrifice pours through the glad sunlight of her soul and breaks the gray clouds of selfishness. May we dedicate ourselves to her heaven-inspired virtues, which time can never touch. Oh, let the heart of mother, carved in its immortal image, rule and transform our conduct until our whole natures are stirred with its blessing. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 59) entitled "Joint resolution to extend the provisions of Public Resolution No. 92, Seventieth Congress, approved February 25, 1929."

COMMITTEE TO ATTEND THE FUNERAL OF THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE CASEY

The SPEAKER. Under authority of the resolution agreed to on May 6, the Chair appoints the following committee to attend

the funeral of the late Representative JOHN J. CASEY, of Pennsylvania.

The Clerk read as follows:

W. W. GRIEST, STEPHEN G. PORTER, EDGAR R. KIESS, HENRY W. TEMPLE, LOUIS T. MCFADDEN, HENRY W. WATSON, CLYDE KELLY, GUY E. CAMPBELL, NATHAN L. STRONG of Pennsylvania, MILTON W. SHREVE, SAMUEL A. KENDALL, HARRY C. RANSLEY, JAMES J. CONNOLLY, ADAM M. WYANT, EDWARD M. BEERS, WILLIAM P. HOLADAY, ROBERT G. SIMMONS, LAURENCE H. WATRES, GEORGE A. WELSH of Pennsylvania, FREDERICK W. MAGRATH, FRANKLIN MENGES, WILLIAM R. COYLE, JAMES M. BECK, CHARLES J. ESTERLY, J. MITCHELL CHASE, THOMAS C. COCHRAN of Pennsylvania, I. H. DOUTRICH, HARRY A. ESTEP, J. RUSSELL LEECH, GEORGE F. BRUMM, J. HOWARD SWICK, JAMES WOLFENDEN, PATRICK J. SULLIVAN, JOHN F. CAREW, and ANTHONY J. GRIFFIN.

RELIEF OF FARMERS IN STORM-STRICKEN AREAS

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on House Joint Resolution 59, to extend provisions of Public Resolution No. 92, Seventieth Congress, approved February 25, 1929, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration, and also that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. GARNER. Is this satisfactory to the member on this side?

Mr. CRAMTON. It is.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 59) to extend the provisions of Public Resolution No. 92, Seventieth Congress, approved February 25, 1929, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said Senate amendment insert the following:

"That the provisions of the public resolution entitled 'Joint resolution for the relief of farmers in the storm and flood stricken areas of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Alabama,' approved February 25, 1929, and any appropriation made thereunder, are hereby made applicable to any storm or flood occurring in any such area subsequently to the date of the enactment of such public resolution of February 25, 1929, and prior to the date of the enactment of this joint resolution: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture, in his discretion, may make loans and advances to vegetable and fruit growers for the fall and winter crop of 1929-30 to an amount not exceeding \$25 per acre."

And the Senate agree to the same.

LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,

Managers on the part of the House.

CHAS. L. McNARY,
ARTHUR CAPPEL,
JOS. E. RANDELL,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 59) to extend the provisions of Public Resolution No. 92, Seventieth Congress, approved February 25, 1929, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The public resolution approved February 25, 1929, authorized the appropriation of \$6,000,000 for the making of loans or advances to farmers and fruit growers in the storm and flood stricken areas of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Alabama for the 1929 crop. The pending resolution as it passed the House merely extended the provisions of the resolution of February 25, 1929, to farmers and fruit growers in the same areas suffering from storms or floods which occurred after February 25, 1929. The Senate amendment to the House resolution enlarged the area for relief by including storm and flood stricken areas in Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi, and authorized the appropriation of \$1,000,000 in addition to the \$6,000,000 carried under the authority of the resolution of February 25, 1929, and also raised from \$3 to

\$50 per acre the amount of advances to vegetable and fruit growers, and made such increase applicable to the fall and winter crop of 1929-30. The conference agreement restores the provisions of the House resolution, eliminates the additional authorization for \$1,000,000, confines the area to the six States originally specified, but accepts the Senate provision for extending the loans or advances to vegetable and fruit growers for the fall and winter crop of 1929-30 modified so as to raise the amount from \$3 to \$25 per acre instead of \$50 per acre, as the Senate proposed.

LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
JOSEPH W. BYRNS,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, the conference report follows the original resolution except the amendment that permits more liberal loans to growers of fruits and vegetables and permits a loan to complete the crop of 1929 and 1930 instead of lending it on the 1929 crop. That is for the reason that they have to plant in Florida in November.

Mr. STEAGALL. Reserving the right to object, I think the gentleman may rest assured that the extension of the period for making loans through the rest of this year and next year will not amount to very much unless the amount of the appropriation is increased more than a million dollars. My information is that the fund of \$6,000,000 is practically absorbed now. The loans have run somewhere like \$100,000 a day for several weeks. That was the reason I had in mind when I attempted to amend the resolution on the floor of the House when it was considered here. I thought it would be soon exhausted, and that is what has happened. I will say that the increase of a million dollars—

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, but the conference report eliminates the increase.

Mr. LARSEN. And carries additional territory.

Mr. STEAGALL. There was only \$1,200,000 left at the end of last week when I had last information about it, and these loans have been running, as I say, nearly \$100,000 per day for several weeks.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan why they excluded the territory that was added by the Senate committee and yet made an extension of time as to the territory to be covered. In other words, they declined to extend the territory to take in flooded areas where they needed assistance to plant the crop of 1929, but they extended the time in the territory covered so as to include another crop.

Mr. CRAMTON. I may say that it sounds like an extension of time, but in fact it is not. The situation in Florida with reference to planting and harvesting is such that they were excluded entirely under the old resolution. The old resolution referred to the crop of 1929. But under this amendment they will be permitted to have added the crop planted in 1929 but not harvested until 1930. As to the extension of the area, our committee felt that that brought in an entirely new proposition, and that any action of Congress for the extension of authority for loans in other States and for an increase in the amount should have the regular consideration by the regular committee and come up in the regular way. Hence our objection to that.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman knows that the committees of the House, except one or two, have not been organized.

Mr. CRAMTON. The committee that would consider this as a legislative proposition is organized.

Mr. RANKIN. When I offered the amendment in the House the gentleman from Michigan made the point of order against it that it was not germane to the bill. That deprived the House, of course, of the opportunity of considering it; but when it went over to the Senate, that body put it on after the Senate had deliberated upon it and considered it carefully in the light of existing conditions, which constitute an emergency, and it seems to me that the conferees ought to have brought back that amendment to the House and let the House vote upon it.

Mr. CRAMTON. When this matter was first brought up by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LARSEN], even though the chairman of the committee [Mr. WOOP] had not been consulted, I yielded to his plea that it was an emergency, because, as Mr. LARSEN stated at that time, the conditions were such that they needed prompt action, and it passed the House promptly; but insistence on the part of another body on loading it down with matters unrelated to it and distinct from it has resulted in a delay of a couple of weeks, and unless we hurry up, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] says, we will not pass this before the money is all expended.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] referred to the balance now on hand. I call

the attention of the House to the fact that the extra million dollars which was put on this resolution by the Senate was coupled with this extension to three other States, and of course if those three other States had been included for subsequent storms and floods, to which the gentleman from Michigan has referred, the \$1,000,000 would not have relieved the situation in so far as the six original States are concerned, which are the subject of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LARSEN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I do not agree at all with the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] that the matter inserted by the Senate was unrelated. It was simply extending this relief to people in the same condition under a similar emergency in other States.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. LARSEN. Is it not a fact that the conferees of the Senate agreed to this, and that the report of the conferees has been accepted by the Senate?

Mr. CRAMTON. That, of course, is true. The Senate accepted this conference report.

Mr. LARSEN. In this connection let me say that even since this resolution was first passed by the House, on Wednesday of this week the most terrible hailstorm in the history of Georgia struck this district. Twenty-four hours after it occurred the hail lay in heaps 2½ feet deep in the great peach section of Peach County, and in Houston County and Crawford County it was almost as bad. It destroyed, so the press says, from 200 to 750 cars of peaches and did about \$2,000,000 worth of damage. This shows the emergency that exists in the territory at this time. That whole area has been devastated by tornadoes, storms, and floods, and by the terrific hailstorm to which I alluded since we passed the resolution less than two weeks ago. I hope gentlemen will realize the seriousness of the situation and let the matter go through without further delay.

Mr. DENISON. This same hailstorm, or one very much related to it, passed over southern Illinois ruining about half their automobiles and half the homes in one of my counties.

Mr. RANKIN. But that is not related, according to the views of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the Congress undertakes to give relief from the result of every destructive storm occurring anywhere, however limited in area, it will be taking on a very large proposition.

Mr. LARSEN. I think the area ought not to be extended, but this is the same area, the identical counties. The damages for which we originally made this appropriation has been augmented to a great extent; the emergency becomes greater and greater every day. Crops are destroyed, and they must be replanted immediately if crops are to be regrown this year.

Mr. STEAGALL. The gentleman will remember that we had unprecedented floods in Alabama in March. Immediately upon the meeting of Congress I introduced an amendment to this resolution which would have given additional funds sufficient to take care of the new misfortunes that have arisen by reason of those floods, and would have extended the application of the fund to make it loanable for the purchase of work stock to enable farmers to cultivate their crops. If the conference report eliminates the amendments that were put on in the Senate, we are not doing any more here than was really provided for in the original resolution.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman is correct—or was intended to be provided for, at any rate.

Mr. STEAGALL. The original resolution limited the application of the funds to certain areas, storm and flood stricken areas, in six States. The amendment to the resolution that was offered simply provided that that fund should be limited to storms that occurred in 1928 and 1929, which was really a limitation or rather a restriction upon the original language of the resolution. That fund is practically exhausted. If no more appropriation is to be made available, there is nothing for anybody to object to.

Mr. CRAMTON. My suggestion is that the gentleman present his matter to the legislative committee in a separate resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement by Senator FESS

and the statement by Senator BORAH with reference to the subject of party loyalty.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing statements of Senator FESS and Senator BORAH. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice that when the Senate wants to put anything in the RECORD it has no difficulty in putting it in over there, and if they want it in the RECORD I think they should take the initiative. Consequently "the gentleman from Massachusetts" objects.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Do you not think we ought to have that right?

Mr. UNDERHILL. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BOWMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

MOTHER'S DAY

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, tomorrow is Mother's Day. The founder of this great national and international movement is a former West Virginian, and this fact alone gives occasion for my humble efforts to pay tribute to the mothers of our country.

The real significance of Mother's Day is founded upon a deep sense of reverence for mother. This reverence is not a product of our modern civilization. It is as old as life itself. In all ages and in all climes mother has been revered. The recognition of maternal love has had no restrictions nor limitations. At the sacred firesides of early family life the unselfish ministrations of mother inspired and created a reverence or an obeisance which centuries of political, social, and religious evolutions throughout the world have failed to destroy. Time has not diminished its brilliancy. In the complexities of our present civilization its radiance is a light unto our pathway which leads to the sanctity of every home and touches our hearts with a sacred veneration for motherhood.

Before the dawn of civilization reverence for mother found national expression in the idolatrous ceremonies honoring "the great mother of the gods." In these ceremonies the power and majesty of mother were exalted and glorified to satisfy and appease the desires of the gods who ruled and controlled the destinies of the people. Mother was honored and worshiped because she alone could allay the consuming wrath of the gods by the supreme sacrifice of her sons upon the field of battle; but the sacred love of mother was not recognized. Motherhood was honored and revered, but the tender, maternal spirit and sacrifice of motherhood had no place in the rites and ceremonies of this ancient worship.

With the advent of Christianity the idolatrous worship of paganism in honor of "the great mother of the gods," which had been adopted and preserved by Greece and Rome, grew into a festival of the "mother church." Finally this festival gave rise to the observance of "mothering Sunday," an annual observance held on the fourth Sunday of Lent. On these occasions apprentices, servants, and frequently prisoners were released for visits to their mothers. It was a holy day in which the love and the ideals of mother were given world-wide recognition. Throughout the Christian world mother was honored by affectionate customs and the maternal spirit of motherhood was exalted and dignified.

The influences of Christianity which gave spiritual coloring to the observance of "mothering day" were not able to preserve and maintain the character and form of these religious ceremonies in honor of mother. Through restless centuries of human strife for political freedom and countless ages of religious intolerance and bigotry and persecution and selfishness, individual reverence for mother was not forgotten, but the world ceased to pay tribute to her and dispensed with the religious rites and ceremonies in honoring her. The pages of history were closed to national recognition of mother until the observance of Mother's Day in our present world-wide movement.

A little more than a quarter of a century ago a loving mother was buried on the sloping hillsides of a cemetery at Grafton, W. Va. A daughter stood by the open grave. The last words had been spoken. The book of a mother's life was sealed. The grave had won its victory. Out of the sorrow and grief of that day there came a mere idea to console the broken heart of this daughter. Here beside the newly made grave of a loving mother was born the great movement of Mother's Day, which was destined to sweep into every clime where language is spoken and touch the indifferent hearts of multitudes with fond memories of mother. That daughter was Miss Anna M. Jarvis, who today honors the House of Representatives of the United States

with her presence in the Member's gallery. Will Miss Jarvis please stand? [Applause, the Members rising and facing the Speaker's gallery.]

This idea was not a new idea. It did not create a new reverence, neither did it ordain a new love nor institute a new devotion. It simply gave national expression to our love for mother and recognized her irrepressible love and influence in the life of the Nation. It thrummed the heartstrings of each individual into a national anthem of veneration of mother. It made Mother's Day a national holy day and established permanently the simple ideals of mother as the common heritage of this great country. This thought was forcefully and appropriately expressed by Hon. A. C. Shallenberger, a former Member of the House of Representatives, in a Mother's Day proclamation issued by him while Governor of the State of Nebraska, when he said:

The idea of Mother's Day is not idle sentimentalism. It has well been called the highest bit of practical sentiment that has ever taken hold of the hearts of men. An organized tribute to mother's love resolves itself into an organized tribute to mother's law, and the recognition of mother's law means love for country * * * and for God.

Within the short space of a few years the Mother's Day movement reached every section of the United States. It was recognized and proclaimed by the governors of 48 States, and many proclamations were issued by them without authority and warrant of law. On the 8th day of May, 1914, Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, signed and approved a joint resolution of Congress designating the second Sunday of May as Mother's Day. This resolution had the unanimous approval and support of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States. The passage and adoption of this resolution as a part of the supreme law of the country constituted the greatest national tribute to mothers ever proclaimed by any nation since the foundation of the world. The influence of mothers in the political life of the Nation was recognized and acknowledged in the language following:

Whereas the services rendered the United States by the American mother are the greatest sources of the country's strength; and

Whereas we honor ourselves and the mothers of America when we do anything to give emphasis to the home as the fountain head of the State; and

Whereas the American mother is doing so much for the home, for moral uplift, and religion, hence so much for good government and humanity: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the Government officials to display the United States flag on all Government buildings, and the people of the United States to display the flag at their homes or other suitable places, on the second Sunday of May as a public expression of our love and reverence for the mothers of our country.

That the second Sunday of May shall hereafter be designated and known as Mother's Day, and it shall be the duty of the President to request its observance, as provided for in this resolution.

Why this national tribute to mother? Hon. W. H. Mann, a former Governor of the State of Virginia, declared in a Mother's Day proclamation, "No State is greater than its mothers." The truth of this statement remains unchallenged. It is proven conclusively both in the experiences and in the exigencies of our national life. The nation is simply a reflection of the home, and that which sanctifies the home necessarily sanctifies the nation. The ideals of one are the ideals of the other. The home and the nation are inseparable. In this sacred union we find the purity and nobility of both resting securely upon the ideals of the mothers of this great country. Our national tribute to mothers is a tribute to the highest and noblest influences that God has placed among men and among nations.

This is a day of retrospection, a day when memory, with gentle and affectionate hands, halts us in the mad rush of this strange and complex age and leads us back over the wandering pathway of our lives to the homes of our youth. Over the rugged, dizzy heights of ambition and success, down through the gloomy valleys of disappointments and failure, we wend our way to the smooth and pleasant paths of childhood where mother first placed our youthful feet. Among the familiar trees and shrubs the old house where we were born seems small and dwarfed. We stand before the doorway of the old home and wonder how the frail wooden door has shut out the memories of long ago. It was here we parted with mother and entered the threshold of the world with many promises upon our lips. Why these promises were never fulfilled we can not understand. We open the door and enter, and with the impulsiveness and enthusiasm of our youthful days we call, "Mother! Where's mother?" just as we were accustomed to do years ago. We listen intently for her broken voice in the strains of some familiar melody.

Here is the old fireplace around which we sat in the long winter evenings after the day was done, and learned, at mother's knee, the story of our country and our country's flag. And here is the little bedroom where mother taught us our simple prayer, tucked the covers snugly and securely around and about us, and lingeringly kissed us good night. It was here that we first knew God. It was here we learned the noble ideals and simple faith of mother. We stand on holy ground.

On this day of retrospection we realize with keen regrets the truth of the statement of William Dean Howells:

A man never sees all that his mother has been to him until it is too late to let her know he sees it.

This realization, however, is tempered and mellowed by the consoling spirit of Mother's Day, which inspires us to live again the dreams, aspirations, and ideals of childhood as expressed by the soul of the poet—

Backward, turn backward, O Time in your flight,
Make me a child again, just for to-night.

Since this is a day of retrospection, for a moment let us forget our apparent indifference and neglect of mother and turn our thoughts to mother's love for us. There is nothing more divine than a mother's love. It is eternal. No human power can quench its fidelity. In our sorrows and disappointments of life, it grows more radiant. In our failures, it grows stronger in the infinite bonds of sympathy. It knows neither success nor adversity. Like a star in the heavens, it shines more brightly on the nights that are darkest. Prison bars can not deprive it; the gallows can not cheat it; and the grave can not destroy it. This is our heritage. The strength of this love is appropriately expressed by Rudyard Kipling in his beautiful poem:

If I were hanged on the highest hill,
Mother o' mine, O Mother o' mine,
I know whose love would follow me still,
Mother o' mine, O Mother o' mine.
If I were drowned in the deepest sea,
Mother o' mine, O Mother o' mine,
I know whose tears would come down to me,
Mother o' mine, O Mother o' mine.
If I were damned of body and soul,
Mother o' mine, O Mother o' mine,
I know whose prayers would make me whole,
Mother o' mine, O Mother o' mine.

In all history there is no more heroic figure than mother. Into every crisis of the civilized world there comes a man of destiny whose very life has been molded and shaped by the loving hands and heart of a devoted mother. It was a mother who gave the voice of prayer to Washington at Valley Forge. It was a mother who steadied the hand of Abraham Lincoln when he signed the Emancipation Proclamation. It was a mother who gave strength and courage to the heart of Wilson in the great maelstrom of the World War. Upon the sacrifices of loyal and patriotic mothers, this Nation was founded and only in the protecting shadows of their unfailing and constant love will it endure.

In the times of war the richest blessings of human freedom have been preserved by the sacrifices of loyal mothers of our country. Their sons have been consumed in the fiery Moloch of war. From their crushed and bleeding hearts have flowed the constant, eternal streams of anguish, grief, and sorrow; but their sublime loyalty and devotion to country have never ceased nor wavered. They have hallowed death upon the field of battle.

During the World War when American citizens were urged to purchase Liberty bonds until it hurt, a mass meeting was held in one of the mining regions of West Virginia. Excitement ran high. The miners were freely indicating their generous subscriptions, when a middle-aged woman, with tears streaming down her furrowed cheeks, arose and said: "I can not subscribe a single penny. I do not have it. I have given three sons to this terrible war; and that is all I have."

This was the voice of a single mother speaking the hearts of all mothers. Oh, the nobility of American mothers! No artist can give it color upon the canvas, nor form in the unchiseled rock. No musician can give expression to its sweetness in symphonies of harmony and melody. The eloquence of orators can neither reveal nor exalt it. It is found in the indomitable spirit of the American Nation in every righteous cause. It can not be conquered. It is greater and more to be desired than the combined forces of the land and the sea and the air in our national defense. It is our first line of defense. [Applause.]

I would not have you believe that the souls of American mothers rise to supreme heights only in the times of war. Their ideals of life are the virtues of peace. They abhor war. They

love peace; but they rebel against a dishonorable peace. They are not willing to abandon war at any price; neither are they willing to leave the Nation defenseless. Catching the vision of a world-wide peace, they have inspired our great Nation in every honorable effort for international peace. When the dawn of that day comes, it will come because the mothers of the country have willed the time when war shall be no more. Their victory will be a victory of peace.

Both in the home and in the Nation there is no substitute for mother. No institution nor professional caretakers can take her place. She alone is charged with the responsibility of citizenship and she should be permitted to perform that duty and obligation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask for five minutes more?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request? There was no objection.

Mr. BOWMAN. In all worthy cases, children and dependent mothers should not be separated. Charitable institutions and organized welfare are worthy, but they do not take the place of the home. The State must preserve the home. The child to-day is the man to-morrow, and upon his citizenship depends the permanency and durability of the Nation. The preservation of the home is worth all it costs.

Within the boundaries of the United States there is a well-defined association or organization of men and women operating around four cardinal doctrines or principles:

First. The abolition of God.

Second. The abolition of all government.

Third. The abolition of patriotism.

Fourth. The abolition of the family.

The efforts of this organization are directed primarily against the sanctity of the American home, and are responsible for the insidious propaganda in the fertile fields of literature reflecting upon the simple faith of our mothers and the integrity of our homes. They endeavor to weaken the faith and destroy the confidence of the rising generation. These avowed enemies of the Nation understand that the destruction of the home eventually means the abolition of patriotism, the abolition of all government, and the abolition of God. On this holy Mother's Day every loyal and patriotic citizen of this great country as a further tribute to the love and the simple faith of his mother should resolve and determine to crush this hydra-headed monster of destructive communism. There should be no place in America for the enemies of the home. The home must be preserved and protected.

If our reverence for mother is genuine we will not offer her one day only for the many she has given us. Mother's Day should be every day. The greatest tribute to mother is found in the lives of her sons and daughters. She is happy and content when her ideals are lived. Her ideals do not constitute a creed, nor a doctrine, nor a philosophy, but an active, ambitious life of purity and righteousness. On this day let us resolve to heed the sweet voice of mother, as we did in the days of our early youth, and honor her with a noble, inspiring life, breathing the spirit of the poet when he wrote:

BE A GOOD BOY—GOOD-BY

How oft in my dreams I go back to that day
When I stood at our old garden gate,
And started for school in full battle array,
Well armed with primer and slate.
And as the latch fell I felt myself free,
And gloried, I fear, on the sly,
Till I heard a kind voice that whispered to me:
"Be a good boy—good-by!"

"Be a good boy—good-by!" It seems
They have followed me all through these years.
They have given form to my youthful dreams,
They have scattered my foolish fears.
They have stayed my feet on many a brink
Unseen by a blinded eye,
For just in time I would stop and think,
"Be a good boy—good-by!"

Oh, brother of mine, in the battle of life,
Just starting or nearing its close,
This motto aloft in the midst of the strife
Will conquer wherever it goes.
Mistakes we will make, for each of us errs,
But, brother, just honestly try
To accomplish your best, whatever occurs.
"Be a good boy—good-by!"

[Applause.]

THE TARIFF BILL

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2667, the readjusted tariff bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2667. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York, Mr. SNELL, will kindly take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2667, with Mr. SNELL in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2667) to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage the industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time has been consumed on this side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon has consumed 3 hours and 50 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas has consumed 2 hours.

Mr. HAWLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for one hour.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in the time allotted to me it will, of course, be impossible for me to discuss all the schedules in this bill, but in that time I shall attempt to discuss and analyze the bill in its relation to sugar and lumber and shingles and glass, and if I have any more time than this I may attempt to discuss in my hour some other features of the bill. After opening this address—and I want to open my address as mildly as I can—I expect to gradually rise as I proceed in my discussion of the bill.

We have had over 30 tariff bills since 1787. This is the worst of all of them. [Applause.]

I have no doubt that the Republican Party could do worse than this, but up to the present time they have not done worse than this in the history of tariff legislation in this country and in every other country in the world. This bill is a monstrosity without a parallel, indefensible in nearly every paragraph.

Since the World War, and following our leadership—and the nations of the world have been following our leadership, even when it is bad—135 nations have revised their tariffs. There are not, of course, that many nations in the world, but there are that many units which have authority to revise their tariffs, and 135 nations of the world, following our leadership and following the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill, have raised their tariffs. But not one of them has yet reached the peak attained even in the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill.

The subjects I shall discuss—lumber and shingles, sugar, and glass—in those three subjects this bill will raise the cost of living in the United States \$460,000,000. This entire bill, when it is analyzed by experts, will be found to raise the cost of living in the United States \$600,000,000 or \$700,000,000, and God knows that under the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill it is high enough.

When Democrats revise the tariff—and they occasionally have done it—the method of doing it has been different from the Republican method. I served on the Ways and Means Committee during the preparation of the Underwood tariff bill. We considered, first of all, the economic effects of the rates we fixed. We consider their effect on the revenue of the United States. We consider whether or not there is a difference in labor costs at home and abroad. We take all those things into consideration and listen to all the evidence we can get, including the evidence of experts, and then with that information we revise the tariff.

But that is a complicated way of doing it. The Republicans have an easier way of doing it. They simply call into secret session tariff beneficiaries, and then they consult them as to what rates they want; and if they can agree as to the burden they want to place on the consumers, that is the rate they get. If they can not agree, then the real labors of the Republican members of the committee commence. They find out the highest rate suggested, and that is the rate that is given. That is

the Republican method of revising the tariff, and that is the way this tariff bill was drawn.

We had hearings extending over two months of time, more extended hearings than were ever had before; but the real hearings commenced after we had got through cross-examining the witnesses who appeared. The Democrats were permitted to participate in the open hearings, but afterwards the real hearings commenced behind locked doors and in committee rooms. Fifteen Members of the House of Representatives in this bill speak for the entire House. Then the representatives of the interests were heard, the vampires who feed on the lifeblood of the Nation were heard. The representatives of the 14,000 millionaires and the 14,000 near millionaires in the United States who bask in the sunshine of the prosperity made possible by the privileges granted them, nearly always by the Republican Party, had their hearings. Those are underground methods; the Democrats were not permitted to be there. Why, GAENER, COLLIER, HULL, and myself, all Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee, were members of that committee before a single one of the present Republican membership on that committee made their appearance on the committee. We were all members of that committee studying the economic propositions which go with a tariff revision when some of the gentlemen on the committee who have been potent in drafting this bill and who have had charge of some of these schedules were at home dreaming of the time when they might come to Washington to represent the interests they have now so well succeeded in doing.

Yesterday they had a Republican caucus. It lasted for two hours. It is the first of a series of Republican caucuses. We know they did two things and that is all we do know anything about. They adjourned to meet some other time and then they gave out this important information to the press, through the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], the majority leader. He gave out this information and this is what it took two hours for that caucus to do—to pass a resolution thanking the Republicans of the Ways and Means Committee for their "arduous, careful, and faithful labors during the last four months." [Applause on the Republican side.] I am glad to hear so much applause on the Republican side of this House. A great many of you who join so vociferously in that applause, when your constituents find out what is in this bill, will not be here to applaud in the Seventy-second Congress. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And now with this brief introduction I want to say that I have all the confidence in the world in my Republican colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee individually and separately, and I have a lot of confidence in the Republicans generally on the Republican side of this House individually and separately, and when they act on their own responsibility, but when they act en masse I have not the slightest confidence in them. [Laughter.] And while I am discussing these subjects I want to be understood as discussing their conduct en masse, the reprehensible conduct en masse of my friends on the Republican side of the House.

SUGAR

Now as to sugar. Sugar is always an interesting question for Republicans. Ever since the beginning of the present century sugar has dragged its slimy, sticky way right through the heart of the Republican Party, bringing to it a large degree of frauds and scandals which always characterize Republican administrations, whenever they have occurred in the history of this country, and I hope some Republican some day will take this floor and call attention to some scandals which have affected the Democratic Party.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. What about the League of Nations?

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Then I will take the floor immediately afterwards and detail and put in the RECORD the scandals which have affected the Republican Party. Oh, the League of Nations. You are getting into it as fast as you can. With your world courts you are crawling into it by the back doors. Through a hundred different agencies you are cooperating with the League of Nations. This country could not exist without cooperating with the League of Nations. You are sending your representatives there—Republican Presidents are doing this—to cooperate with the officials of the League of Nations in the important matters that come up before the League of Nations. You can not keep out of it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. I can not yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman refer to the conduct of Senator Gorman in the Senate with regard to the slimy trail of sugar, some years back, when Cleveland was President?

That referred to sugar, and Senator Gorman was a member of the Democratic Party.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. President Cleveland's administration absolutely had no scandals connected with it.

Mr. STAFFORD. What about the conduct of Senator Gorman in the United States Senate when the sugar schedule was under consideration?

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. If there have ever been any thieves in a Democratic administration, I never heard of any of them [laughter]; but if there were any such thieves, they were put behind the doors of the penitentiary. As a matter of fact, you gentlemen have had so many prominent Republicans in the penitentiary at Atlanta recently that I heard a Republican ex-Member out here in the corridor say that he was a candidate for warden of a State penitentiary. You had filled the State penitentiary with Republican officeholders, and some are just getting out now. He was out of a job, and there were so many in there that it appealed to him and he said, "I think I ought to have this job, because so many of our fellows are going down there, and I know them, that I think I should be there to welcome them as they come." [Laughter and applause.]

Now, with the permission of the Republicans, I will get back to the discussion of sugar.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit a brief interruption?

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Yes; all right.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The gentleman wanted some information as to Democratic scandals. I will say that the records conclusively show that one of the greatest scandals in government in the history of the Republic was the manhandling and mishandling of alien property under a Democratic administration. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. I deny that; but I notice it was a Republican Alien Property Custodian who went to the penitentiary. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. If the Democratic thieves had been sent to the penitentiary, they would have had to put on an annex to the prisons.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. I will admit that the Republican Party is corrupt from the top clear down to the bottom. That is what I think about it, so do not ask me any more questions along that line. [Laughter and applause.]

Way back early in this century, under a Republican administration, in 1903, we commenced to hear about sugar. It was, first, manipulation of the polariscopic test, but that was not a method that was rapid enough to sufficiently deplete the Treasury of the United States, and to suit the Republicans who were in control of the American Sugar Refining Co. they commenced to manipulate the scales with wires stretched through them. The owners of the sugar, as it came from Cuba, did not trust the Republican Party. They knew it. They would not weigh the sugar on the Government scales. They had their own scales, which weighed the sugar correctly, and the American Sugar Refining Co. paid them for their sugar as it was correctly weighed, and then they carried it over to the Government scales and weighed it again, and it weighed less under this manipulation.

This occurred under the Taft administration. Finally the administration was compelled to do something about it. I remember I made a half dozen speeches on the floor here myself during that period of time calling attention to these Sugar Trust thieves.

Why, John E. Parsons, chairman of the Republican central committee in the State of New York, was the manager of the American Sugar Refining Co. and the principal thief among all of them, and his son was one of the leaders on that side of the House attempting to defend him against the charges I made.

I insisted that it was the higher ups, the men who benefited by these sugar thefts, that ought to go to the penitentiary. The President insisted that we must proceed slowly, that we must not give any of them the right to escape by holding a congressional investigation. I called attention to the fact that when the term of President Taft expired the 5-year period of limitation would have expired and none of them could be prosecuted; but the brother of the President of the United States was a Sugar Trust attorney, belonging to the firm of Strong & Cadwalader. The Attorney General of the United States was a Sugar Trust attorney, belonging to the firm of Strong & Cadwalader, and finally these energetic executives succeeded in indicting a few of the little checkers and weighers and sent them to the workhouse for periods of from a week or two to two or three months, and every one of these little checkers and weighers serving these light sentences was pardoned by the President of the United States before they had finished their sentences.

This is the Sugar Trust scandal that meets with the approval of the gentleman on that side, and this is just the beginning of it.

Mr. Wickersham, who was Attorney General at this time, was the same Attorney General who agreed with Mr. Mellon that his company could draft an agreement fixing a world price for aluminum, and it did. He agreed with him that his Canadian company could sign this agreement, and it did; and the other five or six companies in the world using the Mellon patents then signed also the agreement, and Mr. Wickersham said this was all right. So we had the first world trust.

Oh, Mr. Mellon was as powerful then with Republican administrations as he is now, and finally, after President Taft had been retired by a decisive vote, more decisive than had ever been recorded before, having carried only two little States, fewer States than any candidate of any great party ever carried before, he spent a few years in retirement; but when the Harding administration came on, with all its corruption, with all its scandals, when Mr. Daugherty and the Ohio gang were reeking with scandal—many of them have gone to the penitentiary since—it became his duty to suggest who should be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, and when the frequenters of the little green house on K Street were able to get together—the only question was who would be most suitable to them; they agreed on ex-President Taft when they found he was receiving a subsidy from the Steel Trust. He was elevated then to the position of Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, the greatest court in all the world, and he sits there to-day drawing his subsidy of \$10,000 a year in semiannual installments from the Steel Trust, secured by a deposit of Steel Trust bonds, and he does this in direct violation of his own code of ethics which he himself drew for the American Bar Association, and which any of you can read if you desire to do so; and night before last, in a sumptuous apartment in the most elegant of Washington hotels, Mr. Taft and Mr. Wickersham, his old Attorney General, both of them responsible for the escape of the Sugar Trust thieves back in 1910 and 1911, stood shoulder to shoulder and solemnly advised the lawyers of the American Law Institute to go back home and do what they could to enforce the laws.

These Republican Sugar Trust thieves, I always claimed, stole \$12,000,000.

Do you know what their defense was and their defense on the floor? They said I was wrong about it, they only stole three million. They could not deny that because these thieves admitted they stole three million and they paid \$3,000,000 back into the Treasury of the United States.

Now, I do not want to discuss all the scandals in the Republican Party. If I did, I could talk here a week and talk about nothing else. There is not any subject that you can possibly mention upon which more volume of history could be written than the subject of scandals in the Republican Party. And so the Sugar Trust still crawls its slimy, sticky way through the very vitals of the Republican Party.

It was the Sugar Trust and the insurance companies who contributed most of the money in 1896 which defeated Bryan for the Presidency. And they have been liberal contributors ever since to Republican campaign funds and they must be taken care of.

You all received the other day the Doran letter advising you as to the profits made by the Great Western Sugar Co., which handles about one-half of the sugar beets produced in the United States. He called attention to the fact that they had during this fiscal year just closed earned 44 per cent on their common stock.

The next day there came the defense from a high official of the Great Western Sugar Co. I suppose that defense is satisfactory to the Republican side of this House. This was his defense: Why, he said, we only distributed 7 per cent on our preferred stock. Well, that was all he could distribute under his charter—was 7 per cent. He said in effect, if you analyze it, that "We did not make any stock dividends—we were over-capitalized. If we had made stock dividends big enough, you would not be able to say that we had earned 44 per cent on each share of our common stock." That was his defense. These are the kind of profits you are taking care of in this bill.

Sugar is a food. We consume three times as much sugar per capita in the United States as any other nation in the world. Back in the sixties our per capita consumption of sugar was 45 pounds per annum. Last year it was 109 pounds. It is an important article of food in the United States.

To impose this additional duty on sugar means to one industry, the soft-drink industry in the United States, an additional charge of \$17,328,000. This industry is capitalized at \$200,000,000, a greater amount than the capitalization of all the sugar refineries in the United States. There are 12,000 soft-

drink companies. There are 120,000 full-time American employees in that industry—adult American employees. They are not Mexicans and they are not children. You are extending this additional protection upon the theory that you want to preserve the American industry; that if we get into a war—this was the argument before the Ways and Means Committee—we would be in any awful fix if we did not have sugar, and, therefore, we ought to keep that industry going.

You get your labor from Mexico for weeding and cultivating the beets. Americans will not do it.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. What proportion of the labor employed in raising sugar beets comes from Mexico?

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. I do not know, and I do not think the gentleman knows.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. One per cent probably.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. I know that all through the sugar-beet country gangs of Mexicans, during the season, are at work cultivating and weeding the beets. I do know that all through this section you erect barracks for the accommodation of Mexican labor.

I do know, and I have received a pile of letters from men interested in the sugar-beet industry protesting against restriction of immigration on Mexican labor and telling me that they could not get along without it in the beet fields.

I heard one witness, and only one, before the Ways and Means Committee who said that in his locality at one time it looked like they could not get enough Mexican labor, and when that dire situation stared them in the face they went to the public schools for the children and that the children agreed to do it if the Mexicans did not.

So, so far as labor is concerned, you have here a Mexican-labor industry and a child-labor industry. The information with respect to child labor has already been placed in the Record by my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], a Republican member of the Committee on Ways and Means, who was fired from that committee not long ago because he was an honest man, but who was finally put back on again because you could not stand the odium of keeping him off.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. In reply to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. SMITH], if I remember correctly, a Republican Congressman yesterday stated on the floor that one-third of the laborers in the beet fields in the State of Colorado were Mexicans. I refer to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TIMBERLAKE], who made that statement.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. I have been spoken of as the gentleman who said that in the State of Colorado possibly one-third of the labor was Mexican, showing that a great deal of labor was performed by Russians and Japs, and some Americans. I was not able to give the exact figures, but a percentage, probably about one-third, was of Mexican labor.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Here is another honest Republican! One-third of them are Mexicans, the rest are Japs and Russians, and a few Americans, who, I have no doubt, were children.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave here, with the gentleman's permission, to insert brief extracts from the testimony of sugar manufacturers before the House Immigration Committee in respect to the extent to which Mexican labor is necessary for that industry in the United States.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. I have no objection to that being inserted, but ask that the gentleman put it at the end of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Might it not be interesting to describe the conditions of labor in Cuba and in the Philippines, where they produce those crops?

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Why do we not turn them loose? Republicans are not in favor of doing that. The Filipinos work in the sugar-beet fields of the Philippine Islands. The population is composed of Filipinos, not Mexicans or Hindus or Japs or Russians. The Filipinos do the work there because they are intelligent, industrious, and capable, and because they live there and nobody else lives there except a few Americans who do not work at all. That is the answer.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. With reference to the labor situation and the employment of Mexicans, I stated yesterday that my district produces about 3,000,000 bags of sugar. I branded yesterday as untrue any statement that Mexican labor was there employed, or Hindu labor or any other foreign labor. I reiterate that statement now. We produce the beets from which that sugar is made with American-born labor.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. And children perhaps.

Mr. RANKIN. But the gentleman does not deny that Mexican labor is used in other States.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. I am challenging the statement that generally it is true that Mexican labor is used. I made the statement yesterday with reference to my State.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman does not challenge the statement of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TIMBERLAKE].

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. No. But I want this RECORD to show that that is not true of my State.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. If the gentleman will not interrupt me and let me proceed, I will admit for his benefit that his little section does constitute an oasis in this whole sugar business. I am talking about the acreage of the United States en masse. I made this proposition to some of my Republican colleagues. I said, "If you want to build up the sugar-beet industry in the United States, why not put a tariff on beet seed, so that you can raise all the seed in the United States, and make the tariff high enough if you desire, to constitute an embargo," but they would not do that. It takes two years to raise beet seed. We do not raise any in this country. We get the seed from Germany. An industry that depends upon Mexico for its labor and on Germany for its beet seed, has no right to hold up its head among the other industries of this country and ask to be sustained.

Let me tell you what you have done in this bill so far as sugar is concerned. Under a careful examination made not long ago by the American Farm Bureau Association as to the effect of the Fordney-McCumber tariff upon the farmers of the country an analysis was made of the sugar proposition. Original copies of that document are all exhausted, but for the information of my friends on the Republican side I can tell them where they can find it. They can find it reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Sixty-seventh Congress, fourth session, page 5596, volume 67, part 6. With all that explanation even a Republican ought to be able to find it, even if he does not want to find it. They reached the conclusion there that the rates of the Fordney-McCumber bill imposed a burden upon the American consumers of sugar of \$192,000,000 a year. That is a more conservative estimate than I have ever seen made. The estimates being sent out now are that that bill increased the breakfast-bill costs of the consumers of the United States \$250,000,000 a year. I shall leave it at \$193,000,000 or \$200,000,000—along about that. This bill will further increase that charge—and I am making a modest estimate—by \$100,000,000. If this bill becomes a law as it is you will have a charge on the people of the United States on this one item alone of \$300,000,000 a year. How many acres are there in sugar beets and sugar cane in this country and how much is it worth? You can buy any of the land for \$150 an acre. That is an outside figure. There are approximately 800,000 acres in sugar beets in the United States—perhaps a little more—and approximately 193,000 or 200,000 acres in sugar cane. That makes 1,000,000 acres in sugar beets and sugar cane in the United States. You make a charge of \$300,000,000 a year on the consumers of the United States because you have a million acres in sugar beets and sugar cane in the United States. And that charge is an annual charge. In other words, under this outrageous sugar tax you impose on the consumers of the United States each year a charge equal to \$300 per acre for all the land planted in sugar beets and sugar cane. That is an awful price to pay for maintaining this nonexistent industry, dependent for its labor on Mexico and the children, depending for its beet seed upon Germany. At the present time a canker affliction has destroyed the cane fields of Louisiana, and they are going to rebuild them now with what they believe will be a disease-resisting cane.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. In one moment I will, as soon as I finish this.

That shows a lack of statesmanship in handling this sugar problem never equalled in the history of civilized nations by any other nation in all the world. Now they say, "Let us continue this awful charge upon the people of the United States, because if we should release this land from the production of sugar beets and sugar cane they could grow something else on it—potatoes or onions or corn or wheat or other cereals." They do not have to do that. Three hundred dollars per acre would

buy every acre and have half of it left over, and with that half you could reforest every acre of sugar-beet and sugar-cane land in the United States, and it would not go back to compete in its products with other industries. We do this, notwithstanding the fact that under the American flag and under American protection we have the most productive sugar-producing sections in all the world—Cuba, Haiti, the Philippines, Porto Rico. They produce sugar; they produce sugar for all the world.

We are fortunate in extending our control to those sugar-producing islands of the world, and they compete with each other, too. They say the sugar industry in Cuba is controlled by American capital, and they say the sugar industry of the Philippine Islands is controlled by English capital. If that is true, then 120,000,000 people who live here in the United States have advantages which no other section of this world possesses. They have the advantage of possessing right here, half way between those extremes of the world, the territory where sugar can meet from the Philippine Islands and from Cuba and can compete, and where the product can be sold cheaper for the benefit of more people than it can be sold in any other section of the world.

However, I am suggesting propositions of statesmanship, and I do not expect Republican leaders to understand that. There are no statesmen, except those who are dead and who have been dead a long time, so that there is no use in presenting an economic problem which ought to appeal to Republican statesmanship.

Now after paying my compliments to the bill in relation to sugar, I may say that that is not the most indefensible part of this bill. It is difficult to go through the bill and find the most indefensible part. Every schedule in the amended bill competes for that distinction. I understood, and the country understood from the President's speeches and messages, that we were going to spend the summer months here in accomplishing a limited revision of the tariff, a revision that merely equalized the tariff, corrected it here and there, and which would produce something of tariff legislation for the farmer. The child is born, and it comes out a bill of 434 pages, with over a thousand changes in the bill—120,000 words. We never had a bigger bill than this.

I am wondering if the President meant it when he said he wanted a limited revision, just a revision that would correct inequalities here and there and relieve the farmer. I am wondering if he meant it. He did not get it in this bill. There are only 90 or 95 changes in the bill that affect farming and farming propositions and agriculture generally. All the rest of these changes go to other sections of the bill and impose these unconscionable charges upon the farmers and all consumers in the United States.

The country is waiting to hear from the President. You may hear from him when you pass this bill. We never had a President before just like President Hoover. He is our first multimillionaire President. He is the first President who has selected from the ranks of millionaires and multimillionaires the majority of his Cabinet. Ordinarily you would not expect ordinary consumers—and there are nearly 120,000,000 of them in the United States—to get much relief from that kind of an administration. But his word is pledged. We are called together here to effect a limited revision of the tariff to help agriculture. You have not done it.

I will put in as an appendix to my speech the statement from the officials of every farm organization in the United States which reached your desks this morning protesting against this bill. I am wondering if the President is strong enough to veto this bill which so grossly violates his instructions. The country waits with considerable apprehension.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman has quoted the statements made by those who are clamoring for a high tariff on sugar, to the effect that the sugar industry in the Philippine Islands is largely owned by British interests. If that charge is true, and if this bill goes into effect as it is written, will it not be taxing all the American people for the benefit of those British interests who have invested in the sugar industry in the Philippine Islands?

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Yes; of course they will get better prices in the Philippine Islands on account of this bill, if the statement is true. I do not know whether it is true or not. I do not dispute the gentleman's word, but it is Republicans who are making that statement. I have no confidence in them, and the gentleman is quoting them.

Mr. RANKIN. If their own statements are true—which I seriously doubt—to the effect that British interests own the sugar industry in the Philippine Islands, then under this bill the Republicans propose to tax all the American people through this increased tariff for the benefit of those British interests.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. My friend is right about it, of course. In that event we will tax the entire consuming public in order to fill the coffers of British companies.

Mr. OSIAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. I yield.

Mr. OSIAS. Just for a correction. It is not true that the sugar industry in the Philippine Islands is controlled by British capitalists, as the following facts will show—

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Will the gentleman put that at the end of my remarks?

Mr. OSIAS. Just one sentence. Seventy-six per cent, based on the capital investment, is controlled by Americans and Filipinos and the rest is controlled by cosmopolitan groups. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. The gentleman knows what he is talking about. He represents here in this body those islands. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Of course, that is just another Republican lie nailed. That is all [applause on the Democratic side] from the source which knows most about it.

LUMBER AND SHINGLES

I think I might proceed now with a discussion of lumber and shingles and the effect of these increased duties upon the building industry of the United States.

Preliminary to that I might call attention to the fact that paper board, wall board, pulpboard, and boxwood generally now enter to a very large degree in the construction of buildings, and this industry has not been prospering. You give them in this bill an advance of from 5 per cent ad valorem to 10 per cent ad valorem upon their product, I presume because they came before the committee and said they were not prospering, and on account of that statement. We use paper board and pulpboard in building operations in the United States and you give this industry a 100 per cent increase.

I remember one gentleman who appeared before the Ways and Means Committee to speak for the box-board industry of the United States. He commenced his address in this way, "I do not want to make a speech; I just want to file a brief," and he was given permission to do that. I said, "I want to cross-examine the gentleman. I do not know what is in his brief and I want to ask him some questions." He said, "I do not know anything about it." I said, "Does anybody in the room know anything about this industry?" One fellow, rather in a shamefaced way, admitted that he did. I said to him, "You are in conference now with the Secretary of Labor, are you not?" He said, "Yes." I said, "You have been in conference for quite a while?" He said, "Yes." I said, "In 1924 your industry made an agreement with the Secretary of Labor to work your men eight hours a day and no longer than that, and six days a week." He said, "Yes." I said, "Did you keep that agreement?" He said, "No." I said, "You are working men now from 9 to 13 hours a day in the industry?" He said, "Yes." I said, "And you work your men on Sundays, too. That is your clean-up day?" He said, "Yes; we work them there half days on Sundays cleaning up and they work from 9 to 13 hours every week day."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, acting for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], I yield the gentleman 30 additional minutes.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Then I inserted in the record a statement made by the Republican Secretary of Labor calling attention to the fact that they were not making money because they were overproducing and they were overproducing because they worked their men from 9 to 13 hours a day and half days on Sundays.

The 15 men who framed this bill certainly forgot that colloquy and that proof when they gave to this Paper Board Trust, guilty of these crimes against labor, an increase in their tariff duties of 100 per cent. These offenses against decency and against the ethics of labor still continue in that industry, and, therefore, by giving this important industry 100 per cent more tariff than they have enjoyed heretofore you, in fact, say to them, "Go ahead; work your men from 9 to 13 hours a day as long as they can live and stand that kind of work; work them on Sundays; we are going to protect you; we are going to help you." This tariff is an embargo. They are not going to bring in anything from abroad that will interfere with that infamous and contemptible method of carrying on that industry. I thought I would mention this in passing. This is just one of the offenses these 15 Republicans have committed, and it is amongst the least reprehensible. If I get the time I will call attention to some that are worse than that.

I am now going to talk about shingles. The United States production is \$22,000,000. Against that we import from British

Columbia \$3,706,000 worth of shingles, making a total domestic consumption of \$26,000,000. Experts figuring upon the increase in the lumber schedule, the increase in the cost of living imposed upon the home builders of this country by the rest of the schedule, estimate that the rest of this lumber schedule imposes an additional burden upon the people of the United States of \$250,000,000 a year. This increase of 25 per cent in shingles when you bring them from the free list to the dutiable list, this increase of 25 per cent when it is pyramided and reaches the consumer, means an additional \$20,000,000 of charge on the consumers of the United States, in order to enable the lumber barons of Washington and Oregon to maintain an industry which does not exist, because the shingle industry is a by-product industry in Oregon and Washington.

They make shingles there out of the slabs and the sides and ends of logs and out of the timber that can not be used for any other purpose. They are as frugal in those States in these matters as the people who lived in Connecticut were in the old wooden nutmeg days.

They use the waste in the manufacture of shingles. Over 80 per cent of the shingles manufactured in that country are by-product shingles. They say they want this tariff because they have Hindu labor in British Columbia; they do have Hindu labor there, but they have it in Washington and Oregon also, according to the hearings and according to the United States Tariff Commission; not as much of it as they have in British Columbia, but all the Hindus they can get in those States they have employed in this industry. The Hindus in British Columbia are paid as much as white labor in the United States.

They say it costs less to produce shingles in British Columbia than it costs in the United States. On the contrary, it costs more, and the report of the Tariff Commission shows it.

I have here [indicating] some shingles made in British Columbia. They are better shingles than most of you gentlemen ever get to see. According to the United States Tariff Commission—and they employed three methods in getting at costs in Canada—by the No. 1 method \$9 per thousand in Washington and Oregon, and in British Columbia \$9.866 per thousand, and by all three methods the difference is about the same. It costs always more, according to the Tariff Commission, in British Columbia, the labor cost, and yet this burden is imposed upon the people of the United States upon the theory that labor is cheaper there in the shingle mills than in the shingle mills of Washington and Oregon, and the report of the Tariff Commission says that it is not.

Oh, I know why this shingle tariff was placed in this bill. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee lives in Oregon and the chairman of the subcommittee lives in Washington, and they collaborated on this schedule. So the people of the United States are going to be taxed in the building of their homes nearly \$300,000,000 per year because the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee lives in Oregon and the chairman of the subcommittee which had charge of this schedule in the bill lives in Washington. This is a high price to pay for honors like that, but I congratulate these two gentlemen. They have been most effective. I can think of no other two citizens of the United States in my generation who have been able to fix upon the consumers of the United States, unaided and alone, a charge of nearly \$300,000,000 a year for reasons which do not exist.

Now, here is a comparable shingle produced in Washington and Oregon.

Both of these shingles are what are called edge-grain shingles. I think we used to call them quarter-sawn shingles. These edge-grain shingles lie tight and flat to the sheathing, guaranteeing 40 years or more of satisfactory protection. They prevent the lodgment of combustible material. They make the maximum resistance to fire.

The flat-grain shingle, which represents 80 per cent of the production of Oregon and Washington, warps, the nails loosen, it causes all kinds of annoyance and expense, creates fire hazards, and has a life of but 3 to sometimes 15 years.

This [indicating] is the edge-grain shingle produced in Washington and Oregon comparable to the edge-grain shingle 4/4, Royal, produced in British Columbia.

Of course, the Washington comparable shingle, although an edge-grain shingle, is vastly inferior to the similar edge-grain shingle from British Columbia, and it costs more to produce this better edge-grain 4/4 shingle in British Columbia, the labor cost is more, than to produce this inferior comparable shingle in Washington and Oregon.

I have many other samples in my office, but I just brought a few over here to illustrate the point. Here is an edge-grain shingle of the 5/4 class, produced in British Columbia, and here is the comparable shingle produced in Washington and Oregon. This shingle produced in British Columbia costs, by

all the methods adopted by the Tariff Commission to arrive at costs, from 21 to 28 cents more per thousand than to produce the same shingle in the State of Washington, and so it goes through all these comparable grades.

The Washington comparable 5/16 shingle, to which I have called attention, is a shingle which will not grade at all in British Columbia. This shingle is a flat-grain shingle, and this is the shingle you get all through the United States when you order shingles. It could not be graded higher than second grade in British Columbia. Of course, it costs more to produce the comparable British Columbia shingle than to produce this inferior flat-grain or slash-grain shingle produced in Oregon and in the State of Washington.

That is the shingle question; that is the way it works. I have been quoting from figures obtained as a result of the investigation by the United States Tariff Commission and from no other source. This is what has happened to the people of the United States on account of the fact that these influential members of the Ways and Means Committee happen to live in these two States.

There are many other things I could say. I can say this, that I have kept a file of protests I have received against this shingle tariff from the States of Washington and Oregon and from the lumber dealers and builders in those States. I can say for the benefit of these two gentlemen who are making this levy for their native States that I have received more protests from those two States—nearly twice as many—against this proposed duty than I have received of statements favoring the duty.

A few months ago you all received shingles from Oregon. They came to you through the mail, and every one of them was an edge-grain shingle and not one of them was taken from the class of flat grain, the slice-grain shingles manufactured in these States. So these gentlemen who kindly sent you those shingles—and I must confess I was impressed by them myself—were guilty of false pretenses in sending you the kind of shingles they make only in limited quantities in those States. The fact that so many cities have antishingle ordinances is due to these shingles made up there in Washington and Oregon.

LOGS

They keep the tax on logs of a dollar a thousand and refuse to let in logs free from British Columbia for making shingles. But the timber and shingle concerns up there stand together.

One of them owns the timber forests of these two States and the other operates the mills. They play into each other's hands, and so the logging interests of those States have been influential in keeping the tariff of a dollar a thousand on logs from British Columbia. I am led to believe from information I get from the Puget Sound mills that even in that State they would like to have the tariff on logs taken off.

The Fordney-McCumber bill carried the first tariff on logs, as I remember it, and the chairman of that committee then owned an immense amount of timberland in the State of Washington. So during all this period of time we have been laboring under that enormous burden because a former chairman of the Ways and Means Committee had large logging interests in Washington, and now we are going to add to it because the present chairman and his subordinate have constituents who have shingle interests in these two States. And so the influence of these interests not only places a burden on the people who live there, in the interest of these profiteers, but they place the same burden upon all the people who want to build homes anywhere in the United States.

The information I get from reliable sources is that if the present consumption of logs continues there will be no timberlands in private ownership in the State of Oregon 17 years from now. And so that State, on account of its representation—and the same is true of Washington—these States, on account of their representation on this great committee, are soon going to be deprived of this immensely valuable asset. [Applause.]

The evidence shows that the Edward Hines Lumber Co., the greatest of all lumber companies, has completed the destruction of all the forests it owned in the State of Mississippi and goes this year to operate in the cutting of timber under Government supervision on the public lands of the United States in these two States.

Why not let logs come in from Canada without the tax? It will mean cheaper lumber, it will mean higher wages for American labor, it will mean cheaper homes for the people who build them, and who are compelled to repair them.

BRICK AND CEMENT

This is not the only offense committed against the home builders of the United States. We have taken common brick, cement, crude feldspar from the free list and put them over on the taxed list. They are building materials, all of them.

I received a telegram from the brick interests in the northern part of Illinois saying to me—they could not be very well acquainted with me—saying to me, "Please, in the Republican caucus, support the duty on brick. [Laughter.] It will not hurt us any out West here, because imported brick never gets to us anyway, but it will help the brick fellows back East." So that is the charming way in which the tariff beneficiaries get together and agree on things. I never saw one of them who was not perfectly willing to be robbed outrageously himself, if he could only get a bill that would permit him to rob everybody else.

Cedar, maple, and birch lumber are transferred from the free list to the dutiable list, and then they put over on the dutiable list lemon juice and lime juice and sour orange juice if it is fit to drink. If it is not any good, they leave it on the free list. Then these Republican tariff makers know how to balance a bill. After placing these brick and lumber and cement burdens upon the home builders, on the home lovers of the United States, they go to work to balance it by transferring articles from the dutiable list to the free list, and here is what they do: They transfer from the dutiable list to the free list buchu leaves. We do not produce any here. They transfer licorice root. We do not produce any here. They transfer to the free list argol, tartar, and wine lees. We do not produce any of that here. They transfer to the free list chip and chip roping, not specially provided for. We do not produce any of that here. Then they transfer to the free list pheasants and game of different kinds for stocking game preserves, and also certain kinds of cotton gloves, made of cotton or other vegetable fiber, and that is an industry which has never succeeded in this country. Then they transfer to the free list fish scrap and fish meal, provided you can not eat it. We do not produce any of that here. Then, last of all and as the crowning and generous act to the people of the United States, showing to what a degree they are considering their welfare, they transfer urea from the dutiable list to the free list. None of you know what that is, but a good many of you on the Republican side ought to know what it is. Of course, we do not produce it here. That is one reason why they put it on the free list. It is a fertilizer which comes from Germany and which contains a higher percentage of nitrogen than any other fertilizer made. It is the most expensive of all the fertilizers, and its principal use here and almost its sole use in the United States is for fertilizing golf greens; so that these millionaires of ours can go out and have the satisfaction of knowing that without any tax on them their fairways and their golf greens are kept properly fertilized. What difference does it make to Republican tariff makers if they put upon the home builders and the home lovers of the United States these awful burdens if they give these golf players green places to play on and give them to them cheap! Of course, that is the way to balance a bill; that is the way to balance a Republican bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes additional to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I know that I am getting all of this time without objection on the Republican side because what they want to do is to get enough time for their caucus, which is a continuing caucus, to be able to agree to put through these nefarious measures that I am discussing, or some of them at least.

GLASS

I now reach the subject of glass. This bill will be acceptable to some people. It will be acceptable to these millionaires and near millionaires and multimillionaires of ours. It will be acceptable to the interests. It will be acceptable to the Mellons and the Mormon Church, but it will not please the rest of the people of the United States, and the rest of the people of the United States number almost 120,000,000 at the present time. They have been particularly kind to the glass industries. I want to tell you about some of them. The Libby Plate Glass Co., of Toledo, Ohio, is now a \$13,000,000 corporation, due to the fact that since 1922 it has distributed \$5,000,000 of stock. The Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., Mr. Mellon's company, is now a \$50,000,000 corporation, and in 1920 it was a \$22,000,000 corporation. Since that time it has cut several melons and distributed stock dividends, so as to keep down its apparent profits, until it is now a \$50,000,000 corporation. The Ford-McNutt Plate Glass Co. recently doubled its capital stock and is now a \$10,000,000 corporation. I just mention some of them. Others of them have done about the same thing. They are all paying dividends on this watered stock, and if you think you can buy any of it on the market at a reasonable price, just try. Yet these 15 gentlemen have remembered all of them. The addi-

tional tariff on glass means an additional charge on the people of the United States who use glass—and they all use glass—of \$100,000,000 a year. This is a high price for the people of the United States to pay to have Mr. Mellon at the head of the Treasury Department, but, of course, not too high in the opinion of the Republican Members of this body.

Belgium is our competitor in the markets of the world in the production of glass. She is the competitor that we fear, and yet there are two of these companies, the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. and the National Plate Glass Co., which produce every year as much glass as they produce in all Belgium, and we have a number of these glass companies. In 1927 our trade balance with Belgium was \$73,000,000 in our favor. In other words, we sold her more than she sold us by \$73,000,000. This is little Belgium about whom we heard so much during the war. She sends us here of her polished plate glass and other glass products just a little over \$2,000,000 a year. In return for that we inflict upon her this penalty. We have heard of selling abroad cheaper than at home. Under the tariff as it stands now—and I am not saying anything that I can no prove—these Pittsburgh companies, including the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., sells glass, f. o. b. car Pittsburgh, for Canadian consumption 36 per cent cheaper than they sell glass, f. o. b. car Pittsburgh, for American consumption.

That is what is going on. And yet these 15 men, anxious to please these great interests represented in the present administration and so strongly in the last administration, inflict this burden upon the people of the United States. It is a complete revision of this schedule, from glass doorknobs to glass eyes, from polished plate glass to mirrors, from common window glass to the stained glass used in our churches. It is hard enough to build churches anyway. If you build them from brick and cement and lumber and paper board you must pay more under this bill and I do not know of any other material out of which they can be built. If you put stained-glass windows in, in order to enable Mr. Mellon to continue selling abroad cheaper than at home you pay more for it under this bill. There is an increase of 10 per cent in the tariff on stained glass. On the cottage of the poor man and on the little country church in which he worships you place these burdens at the demand of these powerful interests.

I could continue this way all day, exposing the iniquities of this bill. I am not talking to the Democrats now. They know these things. They are not in sympathy with these outrages. I am just trying to give you Republican gentlemen something to talk about and think about in these continuous conferences of yours, to enable you to determine whether or not you are willing to risk your political future by conferring these favors upon the special interests of this country. If it is done, you are responsible. We are not. We wash our hands of it all.

It was said, when the Fordney-McCumber bill was considered, on this side, that the higher rates of the Fordney-McCumber bill would act as an embargo; that goods would not come in; that you would not collect much at the ports. We believed it. The rates were high enough to have accomplished that. But we forgot that the results of the Federal reserve act and the income-tax system and the Department of Labor and the railroad laws and all those things which we did during the Democratic administration were beginning to be felt and were about to produce a reflex action, an era of production and prosperity, and they did. It was our prosperity, following the defeat of the Democrats in 1920, which came on and which you enjoyed. That prosperity—and it was Democratic prosperity—was caused by Democratic constructive measures.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. But even that kind of prosperity can not last always.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Was the prosperity of 1921 caused by Democratic legislation?

Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY. No. The country knew the Republicans were going to get in, and that had its effect, its psychological effect, upon the people of the United States. But the measures that we enacted into law were able to overcome even that psychological fear. Although you were in, it was our prosperity which came to you and which enabled this country to exist and to live and to apparently prosper in spite of the high rates of the Fordney-McCumber bill. You did nothing to bring it about.

In conclusion, I would like to quote the National City Bank, because my friends on that side, the Republicans, will all agree that that is a safe and sane source of information. Get the last circular sent out to you by Mr. Roberts, the financier of that bank. I presume you all got it. There you will find out why our collections at the ports have been getting higher than they were during those former years, why goods have

been coming into a greater extent than ever before. According to the National City Bank it is because we have been loaning to foreign countries our money and they have been buying our goods with the money we have loaned them. The National City Bank calls attention to the fact that the present high rates of interest and other factors are stopping the placing of loans in the United States, appreciably decreasing them; loans to foreign governments, loans to foreign industries. They are falling off at an alarming rate. As a matter of fact, some of these countries are now refunding their loans. Czechoslovakia has done it recently by bonds floated among her own nationals. In that document from the National City Bank which you gentleman have received you will find that if this thing continues, these high money rates, in the fall of this year, following this strain on the country, the period of depression will commence. You can not inflate this bubble always. Some day you will burst it. Read that document.

Now, I hope I have been able to give my Republican friends something to talk about in this caucus of theirs, so that they will be able to do something else except commend the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means for their industry in presenting this bill. [Applause.]

Under permission to extend my remarks, I herewith print the following statement from all the farm organizations in the United States, and I also print the following editorial from yesterday's Washington News, a Scripps-Howard paper:

A STATEMENT REGARDING THE PROPOSED TARIFF ACT OF 1929, H. R. 2667
To Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives:

Representatives of the farm groups and allied organizations whose names are attached to this communication have come to a unanimous conclusion regarding the treatment accorded agriculture in the proposed tariff act of 1929 (H. R. 2667).

Because of the far-reaching effect of this tariff legislation, we have concluded that an obligation rests upon the organizations we represent to make known to you and to the public our views as to the extent to which the treatment accorded agriculture approaches fulfillment of the Republican Party's platform pledge.

First. The bill allows some increases of duties on commodities that come into competition with products of farms of the United States. Those increases will be beneficial to the agricultural producers. But the bill generally will not satisfy farmers because it does not provide adequate duties on major products of the farm.

Second. The Republican Party at its last convention included in its declarations as to tariff the following pledge:

"A protective tariff is as vital to American agriculture as it is to American manufacturing. The Republican Party believes that the home market, built up under the protective policy, belongs to the American farmer, and it pledges its support of legislation which will give this market to him to the full extent of his ability to supply it."

Our examination of the proposed duties in the light of this definite pledge that the domestic market is to be reserved for agricultural producers of this country, convinces us that the bill in important instances has fallen far short of meeting the responsibility of carrying out this pledge to agriculture.

Third. The bill also denies to the agricultural producers of the United States any measure of protection against products imported from the Philippine Islands. This denial was made in the face of the legal right to impose such duties, although the principle is admitted and declared in the bill. The continued granting of such privileges to residents of the Philippine Islands at the expense of our agriculture constitutes one of the important obstacles to our agriculture becoming normal and regaining its rightful share of the national income.

Fourth. The bill also fails to recognize a very serious problem which has become a real concern to our producers during the past decade. This problem has to do with the principle of levying import duties upon products which, although different, can be substituted for commodities produced in this country. The effect of competition through substitution is just as important to us as the effect of direct competition commodity by commodity. With regard to the neglect in the bill of this principle, we call attention to the long list of items in the schedules covering oils and fats and the raw materials from which such oils and fats are extracted, nearly all of which are interchangeable in whole or in part. This principle of substitution is also found operative with respect to other commodities.

Fifth. We are also alarmed by the fact that a very dangerous principle was extended in its application when, in addition to olive oil, palm-kernel oil, which was transferred from the free list to the dutiable list, was allowed to come into the country free of duty when rendered unfit for edible purposes. This proviso may be considered as the entering wedge of the industrial users to get the principle made generally applicable to a large range of oils and fats in case at any time they should lose their fight to keep such commodities on a low scale of duties or on the free list.

Sixth. We are herewith itemizing some of the important commodities imported into this country which should have higher rates than are provided for in the bill as reported:

The oils and fats and their oil-bearing raw materials as found in paragraphs 53, 54, 55, 57, 58, 701, 703, 760, 1728, 1732, 1734, 1794; dairy products as found in paragraphs 19, 707, 708, 709, 710; hides, paragraph 1693; live cattle, 701; long-staple cotton, paragraph 1662; tapioca and sago starch, paragraphs 1755, 1781; dried eggs, paragraph 713; berries, paragraph 736; cherries, paragraph 737; figs, paragraph 740; dates, paragraph 741; peaches, paragraph 745; beans, paragraph 763; mushrooms, paragraph 766; peas, paragraph 767; onions, paragraph 768; potatoes, paragraph 769; tomato paste and canned tomatoes, paragraph 770.

The above list is by no means complete, and other items may be justifiably added to it as result of later consideration by ourselves and others.

We also ask that title 3, section 301, of the bill be so changed as to make dutiable agricultural products of the Philippines imported into this country, with the understanding that the revenues thus derived shall be segregated and turned into the treasury of the Philippine government.

Seventh. The Democratic platform also made promises of tariff increases to agriculture. That platform stated:

"It is a fundamental principle of the party that such tariffs as are levied must not discriminate against any industry, class, or section. Therefore we pledge that in its tariff policy the Democratic Party will insist upon equality of treatment between agriculture and other industries."

In view of this pledge of the Democratic Party, and in view of the manifest failure of the new tariff bill to keep the Republican Party pledge, we now rely upon the friends of agriculture of both parties of the House and the Senate to use every effort to correct these manifest injustices.

Respectfully submitted.

Fred Breckman, representing the National Grange; Chester H. Gray, representing the American Farm Bureau Federation; Charles W. Holman, representing the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation; A. M. Loomis, representing the American Dairy Federation and the National Dairy Union; B. W. Kilgore, representing the American Cotton Growers' Exchange; T. E. Mollin, representing the American National Livestock Association; C. B. Denman, representing the National Livestock Producers' Association; W. R. Morse, representing the American Fish Oil Association; Ed. Woodall, representing the Texas and Oklahoma Cottonseed Crushers Association; J. A. Arnold, representing the Southern Tariff Association; Knox Boude, representing the Tariff Committee of the National Poultry Council.

MAY 10, 1929.

[From the Washington Daily News, May 10, 1929]

TARIFF GONE WILD

The tariff bill is a mess. It is almost everything President Hoover said it must not be. The Republicans in Congress have put the President in a bad political hole.

The President was elected on a specific pledge to limit tariff changes to agriculture and a few industrial schedules. This bill is a general revision. It revises more than 1,000 rates, less than 100 of which are agricultural.

The President pledged adjustments to equalize tariff benefits. This bill makes practically no reductions; it is a wholesale increase.

It will add uncalculated millions to the living cost of the American people in cities, towns, and country.

It will not help the farmers as a class. What benefit to the farmer is a 66 per cent increase in corn tariff when imports are less than 1 per cent of consumption? Or a 100 per cent increase on dairy products when imports are less than 2 per cent? Or a 300 per cent increase on swine when imports are insignificant?

It will hit the common people, and hit them hard. It will boost the prices of food, clothing, and shelter. Sugar is raised 60 per cent. Clothing, blankets, wool are increased. The basic building materials, such as cement, lumber, brick, are pushed upward.

And that is not the half of it. The bill's administrative changes are as bad as the rate revisions. It makes the Secretary of the Treasury, instead of the Customs Court, the final judge in evaluation disputes, and thus opens the way for "American valuation" increases. It eliminates the bipartisan character of the Tariff Commission. It makes the Tariff Commission more subservient to the President, instead of an independent congressional agency. It extends to dangerous limits the flexible system under which the President can fix tariff rates, the constitutional function of Congress.

The bill's threat to our diplomatic relations and foreign trade is alarming. Already 13 foreign governments have protested to the State Department in one way or another against past and prospective tariff barriers. Our best foreign customers are bitter and are proposing reprisals—Canada, Argentina, Cuba, France, Great Britain, and a dozen others. And this foreign trade of ours is what President Hoover and economists describe as the margin of our national prosperity.

Not content with causing a prospective increase in the cost of living, with putting the President in a political hole, with sabotaging the inde-

pendent Tariff Commission, with embarrassing diplomatic relations, with threatening our foreign trade, the framers of this bill also side swiped our civil liberties. It would ban economic, philosophical, and literary classics under a broad prohibition against alleged obscene and seditious publications, making customs officials the sole judges and censors.

After perpetrating such a tariff monstrosity, the Republican leaders of the House are now attempting yet greater folly. They plan to shut off opposition debate with a gag rule.

We hope an alliance of intelligent Democrats and intelligent Republicans will succeed in defeating the bill in its present form. If it passes, we hope the President will veto it as a violation of the campaign pledges made by himself and his party.

But if the bill becomes law the people may not be the only ones to suffer. What about the party? What about the party's experience in the past?

When the Republican protectionists ride too high, they ride for a fall.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for one hour.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the House, of course I have been interested, as you all have, in the address to which we have just listened by my very dear friend and colleague from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], a most agreeable and splendid gentleman in private life; but in my political experience with him I have never known him to be for anything. [Laughter and applause.] It is a pity that a man of his intellect and ability can not be constructively for something worth while as aggressively as he is against everything. It is not likely that the American people will give much consideration to his claim that the Democratic Party has a mortgage on virtue and that Republicans are all rascals. When the day of reckoning comes my Democratic friends will have much to answer for.

Now, as we listened to this caustic tirade by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] I am reminded, ladies and gentlemen, of the anomalous situation that some Democrats are never quite so happy and never quite so cheerful as when they are wandering around in a cemetery among the monuments that have been erected to their Democratic failures. As you know, they just stop and shed a few tears at the shaft erected to the memory of greenbackism. Then they sigh as they approach the memorial to free silver; then they groan as they approach the monument erected in memory of imperialism and the League of Nations; and then they kneel in adoration at the monument of granite that has just recently been erected, with Al Smith's classic profile carved on one side and Mr. Raskob's on the other, and breathe a silent prayer that Al will not run again and that Raskob will pay the shot. [Applause.] My friend and colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] loves to ramble in the old graveyard of scandals, and is never so happy as when he thinks he has discovered a new conspiracy, and endeavors to indict Republican officials. I am reminded, in connection with the sugar scandal that he discussed, that Mr. Hoover, now the President of the United States, and at the war period the adviser of President Wilson, recommended to the President that he buy the Cuban sugar crop at that time. I am not quite certain whether Professor Taussig advised the President in that matter for or against, but I think he advised him against it. At any rate, the President did not do it. If I am in error in making that statement I will correct it hereafter; but the fact is that the Cuban crop was not purchased, and you know what happened to the American consumer when Cuba got ready to put on the vise and squeeze him; and you know what the American people paid for sugar during that period. This exorbitant price of sugar might have been prevented if just ordinary horse sense and good judgment had been used. If this fiasco had occurred during a Republican administration Mr. RAINEY would have had one more scandal to discuss.

We had the other day a little geographical dissertation by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] as to the residence of the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means.

I have here another map of the United States, similar in construction, of course, to the one used by the gentleman from Texas. On this map I have marked by these red spots the residential abode of the 14 Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee during the framing of the Underwood-Simmons bill in 1913. I ask you to notice the tremendous expanse of the United States here that has no red spot on it whatever. [Applause.] I ask you to notice the fact that nearly half the spots are down here in dear old Dixie. Well, the Democrats evidently had an idea that the sun drops down in the evening somewhere just west of Kansas City and that there is no West beyond that. Here we had Hammond, in Minnesota;

Shackleford, in Missouri. I did not mean that spot to be any smaller than the rest of the spots. I really intended it to be larger for GARNER of Texas, although Mr. HUDSPETH called my attention to the fact that it should have been away over here in the western part of the State, but I wanted to keep it as near the Mississippi River as possible. [Laughter.] Then my dear friend and neighbor, Mr. COLLIER in Mississippi; Lincoln Dixon in Indiana, who is now a member of the Tariff Commission; HENRY RAINY, who we have just listened to, in Illinois; Mr. Ansberry in Ohio; Mr. Stanley in Kentucky; Mr. CORDELL HULL in Tennessee. And, by the way, I saw a news item in the Tribune to-day, underneath his photograph, saying that CORDELL HULL would attack the Republican tariff bill. Well, that is not a news item. [Laughter.] If he were going to be for it, of course, that would be exactly like the man biting the dog, otherwise I fail to recognize that statement as a news item. Then the late lamented Oscar Underwood in Alabama; the late Claude Kitchin in North Carolina; A. Mitchell Palmer in Pennsylvania; Francis Burton Harrison in New York; and Andrew Peters in Massachusetts. Now you see, contrary to the layout of the other map, that nearly half of this delegation is south of the Ohio and east of the Mississippi, and the rest are just scattered here and there.

Now, the other day the gentleman from Texas referred to the fact—and I do not know why he did it—that 11 men wrote this bill. Which four did you delete, Mr. GARNER? Your statement was, and repeated by several others, that 11 of the 15 wrote the bill. Now, I am pretty certain we had 15 Members, as near as possible, present all the time and I do not see where that statement exactly fits the facts.

Then he spoke of how generous the Democrats were in their allotment of members to the Ways and Means Committee when a vacancy presented itself. He said, "We had a vacancy down here in Louisiana, and, of course, they were entitled to a member." But, of course, they did not give it to them. Why? Because, you know, the gentleman from Texas is first, last, and always an astute politician, and he said to the boys, "Well, pshaw, we can elect a Democrat down in Louisiana any time we want to, but we are not always sure of electing one in Indiana, so we will name Mr. CANFIELD," and I think they made an excellent choice. Of course, the gentleman from Texas has political sense, and that is the reason he is where he is to-day. Then they had another vacancy and there were a lot of applicants around here, and a good many of them were keenly disappointed because they did not get on that committee. So they ran away up here into the northwest corner in the State of Washington and found a very estimable gentleman, SAM HILL, whom I love and who I think is a splendid type of citizen and a splendid representative of his people. I have no fault to find with him, but I call attention to the political acumen that is displayed at all times in these appointments rather than the broad spirit of generosity that was suggested by the gentleman from Texas. [Applause.]

Now, I do not know whether these 14 Democratic Members were better qualified to write their tariff bill than were the 15 Republicans who made up this bill. We have been a little more generous on the Ways and Means Committee and have given the minority 10 members to our 15, while in those days they gave us only 7 to their 14. We have never reduced the membership on that committee, no matter what the election returns showed as the probable relative number that ought to be on the committee.

Now, the gentleman from Texas laid great stress on the fact that the members of the Ways and Means Committee are all located east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio. Well, what of it? Let us for a moment look over the situation in 1913 and see what the policy was under Democratic methods. Here we find the conditions somewhat reversed, as five of the members were located east of the Mississippi and south of the Ohio; and again I say, What of it? What difference did that make.

Men on the Ways and Means Committee, I imagine, are not selected particularly because of their geographical location; in fact, this matter of geographical location of committee members is not worth considering, and I regret that the gentleman from Texas has seen fit to attempt to arouse sectionalism during the discussion of a subject that has so far-reaching an influence on the economic welfare of all the people of this great Nation.

I hope the time will come when we can discuss economic questions in this House in a friendly way and that we will wipe out allusions to the North and the South and the East and the West and recognize that we are one united country, united in purpose for success and prosperity. [Applause.]

Mr. HOWARD. Would the gentleman be agreeable to an interruption?

Mr. CROWTHER. I shall be pleased and honored by an interruption from the sage of Nebraska. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOWARD. The interpolation which I desired to submit was this: Recognizing as I do the wicked sectionalism involved in the making of that other tariff bill under Democratic control, of which the gentleman speaks, I would like to ask him if that wickedness then has now become a virtue when practiced by the elements in his own party?

Mr. CROWTHER. Oh, I will say to the gentleman from Nebraska that I disclaim making any statement with regard to either wickedness or conspiracy. I say, "What of it?" What if they were in that locality? They were picked out for their ability and for their brains and for their capability. They were not picked out because they lived in that particular locality. The suggestion as to sectionalism should never have been made.

Mr. HOWARD. The disclaimer is entirely satisfactory. [Laughter.]

Mr. CROWTHER. Now, you will remember that toward the close of the last session, during a colloquy with my former colleague from Texas, Mr. Black, I called attention to the fact that the very recent conversion of my Democratic friends to the cause of protection should not be taken too seriously. A lot of my friends at home after the election said, "Oh, you will have no trouble in writing a tariff this year, because the Democratic Party is a protection party. They have so declared, and you will not have a bit of trouble this year." But it seems to me that I hear still some of the rumblings of discontent and some of the same type of criticism that has been hurled at the Republican Party over a great period of years is now hurled at this bill as presented. I felt that while the Democrats would no doubt point with pride to the fact that their platform called for a protective tariff policy, a great many of them, however, would view with alarm some of the rates or some of the features of the administrative section that would probably prevent them from voting for the bill, and now, sure enough, this has happened.

Let me just read from the RECORD some excerpts from the speech of my distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. GARNER] made in the House Thursday, May 9.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell you something that I could not do. I did not dream the Republican members of the committee were going to submit the proposals they have.

I imagine it was a great shock to him when he read this bill, not really so much of a shock to him, personally, because he is rather inclined to be a protectionist. I will discuss that later.

But I could not support this bill even if it carried the rates in it that I would write.

Now, I just do not get that—

But I could not support this bill even if it carried the rates in it that I would write.

There must be something wrong with something else besides the rates, is not that so, Mr. GARNER?

And I want to say also that if I had the privilege to sit down and write the rates in this bill, and it was to be the law, I would give adequate protection to every industry in the United States just as far as my intellect would permit.

That is good, sound, protection doctrine, and I congratulate the gentleman on that statement. It will meet with approbation in his territory and in his State and in the Union. You know the conversion of my colleague from Texas rather antedates the conversion of the members who were communicated with by the Raskob hypotelegraphic method during the late campaign.

By the way, why not call the roll. There are not so many of you Democrats here to-day, but I would like to have all the Democrats stand up or hold up their hands who vouched for their attitude on protection in answer to Mr. Raskob's telegram. I want to separate the sheep from the goats. I want to look you over. I challenge you to stand up. [Laughter.] In the words of the gentleman from Texas, I challenge you to stand up. He has been challenging my side for years and getting away with it. [Laughter.] Now, it is my turn to challenge. I do not hear any unusual commotion, or creaking of knee joints in your anxiety to rise and be counted. Is there not one honest soul with conviction as regards his preelection promise, who will stand up and say he answered that telegram and that he was for it—not one? [Laughter and applause.] Well, perhaps the liberal ones who would have answered are out on the Green Urea golf greens referred to by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINY] this afternoon. [Laughter.]

The gentleman from Texas further said:

I tell you on my honor that when I approached the question at the beginning of the session and at the hearings I did it with the hope that I might vote for the bill.

Oh, how you did lie awake nights, Brother GARNER, praying that you could vote for the bill. [Laughter.]

I wanted to vote for it, and was anxious to vote for it. Every Member on this side of the House knows it.

I suppose he pointed to the Republican side, and then he said:

I was anxious to vote for it because I thought the tariff ought to be taken out of politics.

That would leave you Democrats in what my friend from Mississippi [Mr. COLLIER] would call a "terrible situation." [Laughter.]

Well, the gentleman from Texas deserves credit for putting his country ahead of the party. He says:

I wanted to get rid of it as a political question not only for the benefit of the country, but for the benefit of the Democratic Party and because a large majority of the people are in favor of protection on something.

I guess that is a true, fair, square statement. I have noticed repeatedly that when there was no opportunity to have a record vote the gentlemen on the Democratic side stood up and voted for tariff duties on certain commodities that were produced in their own States and then with religious fervor, and with fingers crossed they voted against the final passage of the Republican tariff bill. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Texas goes on—

There is not a United States Senator—and there are 96 of them—that you can find who will say that he is opposed to protection on everything. So from a practical standpoint—

And the gentleman from Texas is a mighty practical gentleman; he plays as good a bridge hand as anybody in the United States—he says:

So from a practical standpoint, as one who believes that the Democratic Party ought to succeed in the control of the country, I was anxious to do what I could to further its interest in that particular.

That is a laudible ambition, and I know that the gentleman from Texas would like to be the new Moses to lead his people from the desert of free trade to the land of prosperity and protection. I say to him now if you want to vote for it, we hold out to you a helping hand, we will throw out the life line, and give you a chance. All hope is not gone. You will have a chance later on and under your leadership it may be that we shall have a verification of the sentiment that was broadcast to the country last fall that you had at last admitted that we were in some degree correct as to the policy of protective tariff.

I do not think that the Democratic Party really decided to be a protectionist party last fall, but they at least took a step in our direction and held out their hands and said, "You are fairly nearly right on the subject; we are not quite ready or willing to go along," but how my Democratic brethren did writhe and twist when Al took his brown derby off at Louisville and bowed to the Republican Party and said, "On the question of the protective tariff you have always been right and we have always been wrong." [Applause on the Republican side.]

You know that the conversion of my colleague from Texas really commenced when the emergency tariff bill was written in the closing days of the Wilson administration. It was written specially for the benefit of agriculture, and in spite of the criticisms that have been hurled at it, while it did not immediately raise prices—and no tariff bill immediately raises prices—it did stabilize conditions and was a tremendous benefit to agriculture, and especially to the woolgrowers in the United States.

One of the best tariff speeches ever made on the floor was made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] on the emergency tariff bill. The bill was vetoed by President Wilson and afterwards became a law under the Harding administration and was of material benefit to agriculture.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Will the gentleman tell me where I can find that speech?

Mr. CROWTHER (reading):

Where is that tariff speech strong and bold,

So filled with fire and vim,

Where is it laying its weary head?

Don't ask me, "ask him."

[Laughter.]

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I want to say that I have searched for that speech several times and have not been able to find it.

Mr. CROWTHER. Now, I shall read to you the last verse of this poetic effusion:

Good-by, tariff speech, alas, good-by,
I'm afraid you will never get back;
What's that you say! where has it gone?
Don't ask me, ask Jack!

[Applause.]

Now, gentlemen of the House, after we have had a little of this light diversion, I want to talk a little about the tariff bill. Of course it was too much to hope that this committee or any other committee would write a bill that would be perfectly satisfactory to everybody. Why, it is not even satisfactory to our side. You gentlemen know that. It is not entirely satisfactory to the committee, if you take into consideration their individual opinions. Nobody can write one, I do not care how great their ability or how keen their intellect, no committee of 15 men can write a tariff bill that will exactly suit themselves or suit the Nation, suit industry and suit agriculture. Of course this session, as has been repeatedly said, was called primarily for the benefit of agriculture, and yet we all know, it is axiomatic, that duties that are levied on agricultural products where we are already on a large export basis are going to be of no particular value in raising the price of the commodity for home producers. That goes without saying, there is no further discussion necessary regarding that phase of the subject.

Then there was involved the problem of the Philippine importations that indirectly take the place of dairy products in this country. Take, for instance, the copra and the coconut oil. I gave that considerable thought, as I know the committee did. This coconut oil and oils of that character are made into butter substitutes. While we are a pretty prosperous Nation, we always had and always will have in this country a class of folks whose bank account is not very large. I am as willing to admit as anybody that even in our prosperous condition that situation will probably continue.

The Socialists used to think years ago that they had a scheme that would evenly distribute our prosperity, but they long ago gave up that Utopian hope. Take the ordinary man who is earning decent wages, who has a family of five children. He can buy these nut-butter products for from 21 to 23 cents a pound, where he can not afford to buy butter when butter gets up to 49 or 50 and 51 and 52 and 53 and sometimes up to 60 cents a pound. Many people prefer them to animal fats. The farmer has the advantage. Generally he does not have to buy butter, as he has it on his place, although I have known farmers to bring all of their butter to town and sell it to me and my neighbors and then go downtown and buy the margarine substitutes to take home to their families. Then, of course, there was the legal question involved as to what the constitutional rights were in levying a duty on Philippine products and what we ought to do with regard to a limitation of imports. Personally, I would have been willing to vote for a limitation of 600,000 tons of sugar from the Philippines, particularly in view of the evidence given by General McIntyre that 500,000 tons was probably their peak production. I thought 600,000 tons would be fair and liberal as a restriction, but I was only 1 on a committee of 15 and we abide, as you do, by the majority opinion in the consideration of these various matters.

All of the schedules, I think, are interesting to everybody, and I hope later to talk for a little while about the sundries schedule, and may, in passing, talk about one or two of the others, although I do not want to encroach upon the rights of those who have had them under immediate consideration. In passing, I want to say that my friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINY] talked about the expense of stained glass in church buildings. We did not put any new duty on stained glass. The evidence led me to believe an increase necessary if we desired to keep the industry alive and prosperous in this country, but we did not do it. We did not put new duties in hundreds of paragraphs that I thought should have had new duties put on.

The fact of the matter is that the evidence was in a great many cases that there was a differentiation of from 300 to 500 per cent in labor costs between the United States and various foreign countries. Under such circumstances it was a difficult matter to write rates of duty that would look sensible. We have advocated using the difference in production costs as a base for levying duties, and you Democratic folks suggested in your tariff program last fall that no duty should exceed the percentage that would represent the difference between the production costs here and the production cost abroad. The fact of the matter is that the spread is getting so great and largely because of low wages abroad that I am afraid before long we shall not be able to use it as a basis, because it represents a percentage

that would look ridiculous when translated into an ad valorem duty. Take, for instance, the match industry. It was shown conclusively that it would take 32 cents a gross on the strike-on-the-box matches to balance the cost of production between here and abroad. The American Diamond Match Co., at the request of the Government and at their great expense, built a plant costing \$2,000,000 in Savannah, Ga. For years it has not turned a wheel or done a stroke of business. The Government refused to help them in any way in the construction of the plant, and they have had great difficulty, they say in their statement to their stockholders, to have any recognition as to amortization for obsolescence and depreciation of that property in their tax returns. The result is that it stands there idle, and they are unable to employ labor in that territory. They say to the stockholders in their report—and this was not a brief to the Tariff Commission or the Ways and Means Committee—that the differential in production costs between here and Europe was too great to get any consideration politically.

So that they have given up all hope of having any real tariff protection, and have notified their stockholders that they are going to manufacture in the United States as near as it is economically possible and are going to manufacture abroad and import from abroad for their other necessities. We ought to be able to put on a duty that will not drive American capital to the necessity of stating to their stockholders that they are going to manufacture here when it is economically possible and that the rest of their needs they are going to supply by building factories in foreign countries, and importing as well, the product of foreign-owned factories.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CROWTHER. Yes; I yield gladly to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLLIER. I realize that there are great differentials, as the gentleman said, and I know that the gentleman had a great deal to do with writing the sundries schedule, and so I want to ask the gentleman the question that I asked the chairman: Did you, as far as possible, in fixing the rates on sundries, attempt to go any farther than to find as nearly as you could—which of course can not be accurately determined—the difference between the cost of making it over here and the cost of making it abroad?

Mr. CROWTHER. Let me say to the gentleman in explanation that we did not always have the figures of cost production from our experts on the Tariff Commission, because we had only those figures on such commodities on which an investigation had been ordered, so that there were thousands of commodities in the various schedules where there were no records; and the only thing we could do was to take the figures of American manufacturers, or groups of them, who supplied American production costs, and then we compared them with the invoice price of the commodity coming in from the foreign country. But wherever we could get the production costs we applied them as closely as possible in determining the rate.

Mr. COLLIER. Without adding what you might call a reasonable profit to the American manufacturer?

Mr. CROWTHER. I do not think that was done in a single instance. Of course, to the foreign production costs we had to add transportation, insurance, packing, duty, and so forth, in order to determine the degree of competition that was involved. I think every case was treated fairly in this regard.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROWTHER. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. The gentleman from New York, being one of the Republican Members representing protected constituencies, can the gentleman assign any reason for their not protecting stained glass?

Mr. CROWTHER. I am only just one Member, and I can not undertake to explain to you what may have been in the minds of other Members. We were endeavoring to make a limited revision, and I said to some of my colleagues, "When you have 1,200 witnesses before you, who give their testimony and evidence as to the necessity of protection, who are you going to commence with and who are you going to finish with in preparing this limited revision?" I did not receive an answer. Here is a telegram which I have received from a labor business agent who says the stained-glass firms are closing all over the country and one-half of the factories are idle. I will read it to you:

NEW YORK, N. Y., April 20, 1929.

Congressman FRANK CROWTHER,

Ways and Means Committee, Washington, D. C.:

Stained-glass firms closing and failing all over country. About one-half of workers idle. We need a protective tariff to save us. Increase

the duty on stained glass under section 230 of tariff act, as proposed by National and Leaded Glass Association. Take from the free list stained-glass windows imported that cost in country of origin less than \$35 a square foot.

WM. E. MULDOON,

158 East Forty-sixth Street, Business Agent, Local 520.

This refers to the kind of stained glass the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] was talking about and applies to fine marble or plaster statues. When there is evidence given that they have been presented or given to a church or secular institution they come in free; the smaller statuary of plaster comes in at a small duty, far too small.

Here I have a letter from George F. Troutwine & Sons Co. (Inc.), manufacturers of shoe leather. They say:

GLOVERSVILLE, N. Y., May 9, 1929.

Hon. FRANK CROWTHER,

Washington, D. C.

HONORED SIR: With much interest we have read the full context of the so-called tariff bill, and for anyone who had hopes ever since the Republican nominations at Kansas City we must honestly say that we are like the traveler in the desert and saw a mirage, only one possible outcome (fooled), and what is worse, by one's own party.

Apparently facts mean nothing to lawmakers, for if they did, shoe leather and boot-and-shoe interests would have at least received mention at the hands of these builders of a tariff bill.

We beg to remain, honored sir,

Very truly,

GEORGE F. TROUTWINE & SONS (INC.),

CHARLES L. TROUTWINE, President.

Perhaps the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BACHARACH] will show you a similar type of letter that he has received from some men in the steel industry in this country after the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] charged that he, together with Mr. Grundy, wrote the steel schedule. I will say to the gentleman from Texas, "Mr. GARNER, you know that Joe Grundy and Congressman BACHARACH did not write the steel schedule"; but, of course, I know that the gentleman from Texas is the best front-page Member in this House. [Laughter.] He allows his imagination to run riot. That is what puts him on the front page. I might say, quoting Mr. Troutwine, "Apparently facts mean nothing to lawmakers." Otherwise the leather manufacturers and shoe manufacturers, as Mr. Troutwine says, "would have at least received mention at the hands of these builders of a tariff bill." You see, there is a little vein of sarcasm in that letter. [Laughter.] He is a citizen of standing in his community and one of my constituents.

Now, if there is an industry in the United States that is on crutches to-day, if there is an industry in the United States to which the President's yardstick ought to be applied, it is the leather industry. The President in his message gave us a yardstick when he said rates should not be considered to be raised until it had been shown that the domestic producer had been suffering by keen competition, resulting in great unemployment. There is over \$100,000,000 invested in the leather industry in the United States, and they have been running along in the red for several years. I have statements by some of the leading concerns in my district covering their business for the last three years in which they say they have been "holding on by the eyelids" like the brick people and the cement people.

You complain about the duty on cement. What will the duty on cement do? It is 30 cents a barrel. It will allow the cement manufacturer on the eastern coast of this country to lose a little less money than he is losing now. That is about all it will do.

And here are these leather people and the cement people and the brick manufacturers, who have been on the ragged edge for several years. They had no chance of appealing to the Tariff Commission, because they were on the free list. As their business losses increased as the years went on, we told them, as they say in New England, to grin and bear it. It is like the story of the fellow in bed suffering with the toothache. He was disturbing his wife by his groaning and moaning and saying, "It hurts me so," and she said, "Jim, get into bed; you have got to grin and bear it." He said, "Kate, I will bear it, but I will be damned if I will grin." That is the way people in the cement, brick, leather and shoe industry, and many others have had to do in this country. They have been bearing it, and they need not apologize to us for not grinning. But they need help and here is our opportunity to do something for them. They are Americans, employing American labor, and deserve our consideration.

There have been suggestions made all along the line that we just come here and write an agricultural tariff bill and that we change section 315 so as to get decisions from the Tariff Com-

mission within 90 days and not write any more legislation. The suggestion has been that we submit all of these suffering cases and all of these needful cases to the Tariff Commission. Well, that does not mean anything but delay unless we abolish the method of making foreign production costs necessary. There is an opportunity here for us to do something to correct the injustices that exist at this time. To do what has been suggested would only be passing the buck, that is all, and I never believe in passing the buck; if there is anything to do I believe in doing it right now, on the spot. This is the time for us to do it, and I hope all the Members of this House will come to the rescue of the farmer, who is pleading for a tariff on his basic products. I hope we will see to it that the cattleman, the stockman, the cowman, and the everyday farmer, or agriculturist, whatever you may call him, gets a duty on hides. [Applause.] Let us have a duty on hides, and compensatory rates on leather and boots and shoes.

Gentlemen of the committee, if the principle of a protective tariff as a policy has any degree of soundness in its fundamentals it ought to apply all along the line. It ought not to apply in one place and be barred in another. [Applause.] We can put a little duty on hides. You could put a duty of 5 cents a pound on hides. Suppose that raised the value of the hides to the price of the duty. You know my contention is that the duty does not raise the price of the commodity—that is, the full price of the duty. Suppose it raised it $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents and a hide weighs 60 pounds; that would be \$1.50. Suppose the ordinary farmer skins two critters a year. That would mean \$3. Some of the wild shoe men say shoes will cost 30 cents a pair extra with such a duty. Well, suppose a man has 5 in his family and buys 10 pairs of shoes in a year. He has got his \$3 back from the value of his hides if he only gets half of the hide duty, and I do not believe it will add 30 cents to a pair of shoes.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROWTHER. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman tell me how he feels about a tariff on naval-stores products and pine tar?

Mr. CROWTHER. Well, I want to say this to the gentleman from Florida: That I heard pine tar recommended the other day by the gentleman from Oklahoma as a cure for the epizootic in mules, and I want to say that the party whose emblem is a near relative of the mule is in great need of a dose of pine tar, and it has never been in greater need of it than at the present time.

Mr. GREEN. I would like the gentleman to tell me whether he favors a tariff on naval stores, because that is one of the most important industries in the whole Southeast.

Mr. CROWTHER. I want to say to the gentleman that I am always in favor of protection on any commodity that needs it, whether it is in Florida or any other section of the country. I am for it as a matter of sound American policy, and it does not make any difference to me where it is needed. [Applause.]

Mr. RAGON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROWTHER. Yes.

Mr. RAGON. I have forgotten the rate asked on hides and also the compensatory tariff on shoes. If the gentleman has that information I wish he would put it in the Record.

Mr. CROWTHER. Well, if we should put a duty of 5 cents a pound on hides it would probably have to be 10 per cent on sole leather and 20 per cent on other grades of leather, and that would probably necessitate a duty on shoes of probably 15 to 20 per cent; that is, shoes of all leather. I think that would be enough, and shoe manufacturers have testified that a duty on shoes would not add anything to the price of shoes to the ultimate consumer, due to the very keen competitive conditions. They claim, however, that a duty on hides would increase the price of shoes. Their estimates vary from 4 cents to 30 cents a pair.

Mr. RAGON. The gentleman believes, then, on account of this competition, that a tariff on hides and a compensatory tariff on shoes would not be reflected back to the consumer?

Mr. CROWTHER. Not to any great extent.

Mr. RAGON. Not to the extent of the 20 per cent?

Mr. CROWTHER. By no means.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROWTHER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I recall that when the calf-leather tanners appeared before your committee the representatives of that industry stated that a tariff on calf leather would not necessarily increase the cost of the product, because at the present time they are only running between 50 and 60 per cent capacity, whereas if they could get more business, they could cut down their overhead. So it does not necessarily mean that because there is a tariff there is going to be an increase in the cost of calf leather.

Mr. CROWTHER. I think the gentleman is right, and that has always been my contention.

The fact is that in 1928 there was imported into this country over 54,000,000 feet of calf and kip leather that came into this country free of duty, and several million feet of that leather was used for a thousand other purposes than making shoes. Calf leather was carried as an exception in the leather paragraph. If it was to be used for shoe purposes, of course, it was allowed to come in free; but it has come in in great quantity, labeled with a black rubber stamp "Calf shoe leather," and has been used for a thousand other purposes, defeating the original intention of the legislation.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. CROWTHER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Is it not the fact that this 54,000,000 square feet of upper calf finished leather that was imported into our country last year equals 41 per cent of the entire calf leather that is used in the manufacture of shoes in our country to-day?

Mr. CROWTHER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Is there any other industry in our country that is suffering to that extent? Does the gentleman know of any other industry that is suffering to that extent to-day?

Mr. CROWTHER. My friend from Ohio [Mr. MURPHY] suggests that the pottery industry is perhaps in about the same position.

You will admit, and I think even my friend from Texas will agree, that when imports are 41 per cent of domestic production there is a fairly reasonable necessity for a protective tariff duty.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROWTHER. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. I agree with that. Why did you not put it on oils, as you first explained here?

Mr. CROWTHER. Well, I would, if I had my way about it. I would like to put it on. [Applause.] We brought into this country 80,000,000 barrels and I am for a duty on oil; in fact, it is just like carrying coals to Newcastle to ask me if I am for a duty on anything. [Laughter.] If I could write this bill I would write it so it would satisfy everybody. But some of my colleagues on the Republican side think that perhaps I go a little too far in my advocacy of protective tariff. The trouble is, when we present the bill you Democrats find fault with it because of what is in it and the Republicans find fault because of what "ain't" in it. [Laughter.] That is not very grammatical, but it is expressive.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will the gentleman again yield?

Mr. CROWTHER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Is it not also the fact that the chemicals and the dyes that are used by the calf-leather tanning industry in our country have a high protective duty on them at this time?

Mr. CROWTHER. The chemical industry is well provided for as to rates.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Then notwithstanding the fact that their finished product is on the free list, the material which they have to use in manufacturing calf leather has a high protective duty on it.

Mr. CROWTHER. There is no question about that.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. And is it not also the fact that Canada has a duty of $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent on calf leather and yet in 1927 Canada exported into our country, duty free, over \$3,000,000 worth of upper calf finished leather?

Mr. CROWTHER. Let me say to the gentleman that every country in the world, except Great Britain, has a duty on leather.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. CROWTHER. With regard to the shoe business I want to say further that there are 200,000 Americans employed in the production of American-made shoes, a majority of whom have been unable to obtain steady employment for many months. In many cases their plight is due primarily to the fact that they can not compete with shoes, the product of Czechoslovakian labor, which produces the same work for less than one-fourth the wages which American workers must receive if they are to maintain American standards of living. Not only do American shoe workers feel that they have been discriminated against in the proposed law, but they are further discriminated against in view of the fact that if the product of their labor in shoes were to be imported into Czechoslovakia a duty of 15 per cent would be levied against it.

So we are getting shoes from a country that holds a duty of 15 per cent against us, and they are using our market to dump their products in free.

Mr. COLLIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROWTHER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLLIER. Will the gentleman please tell the House and the country why it was, inasmuch as they have been working together for three or four weeks and have had nobody to bother them, that all these rank injustices have occurred. Why was it you gentlemen did not fix this bill up to suit you? I am asking this for honest information, you know.

Mr. CROWTHER. Yes; I know the persuasive manner of the gentleman from Mississippi and his method of seeking information. It is a sort of "Will you walk into my parlor, said the spider to the fly" method. [Laughter.]

He is a gentleman of marked intellectuality; he would have made a big speech on this bill before this if he had not unfortunately fallen down and injured his right arm, because when the gentleman from Mississippi makes a speech, without his dramatic gestures it would be like Hamlet without Hamlet. It would be impossible. [Laughter.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. The gentleman has not answered the question.

Mr. CROWTHER. I will say to the gentleman from Alabama that I did not answer it, but it may be that some of these difficulties will be ironed out before we are through. [Applause.]

Mr. COLLIER. One question more if the gentleman will yield. I want to say that the gentleman answered it to my satisfaction, and as the chairman of the committee says I did not make out my case. [Laughter.]

Mr. CROWTHER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask permission to incorporate in my remarks an article from the American Wage Earners' Protective Conference located in New York, one of whose members, Mr. Matthew Woll, gave some valuable testimony before the Ways and Means Committee. Their motto is "Buy American-made goods."

AMERICA'S WAGE EARNERS' PROTECTIVE CONFERENCE,
Washington, D. C., May 9, 1929.

HONORABLE SIR: The wage earners of our country, following the announcements of both political parties and their candidates for national office, prior to and during the last national election, had full right to believe that a tariff bill would be enacted which would insure to American workers full employment opportunities.

The tariff bill presented by the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee states that one of its purposes is "to protect American labor."

There are many cases in which this intent is carried out. Yet it would seem that the committee has selected one industry, namely coal-tar products, upon which to lavish full protection. We are not opposed to any American industry receiving full and adequate protection. We do, however, protest against special privilege being given to one industry wherein the total number of workers is less than 9,000 and of these a majority receive less than a living wage. We are opposed to special privilege being given to an industry of less than 9,000 workers if industries employing hundreds of thousands of American workers are to be discriminated against in the same law.

Prior to the committee hearings being closed we, in writing, petitioned the committee to either eliminate special privilege from the tariff bill or to extend real protection, namely, American valuation, to all imports. We wish to be consistent and trust that we will have your support and cooperation in either extending American valuation to all imports or eliminating it from one seemingly favored group.

Before the committee had concluded its work we presented to each individual member of the Ways and Means Committee a suggested amendment which reads as follows:

"The foreign value of any article for the purpose of assessing duties under this act shall not be less than 60 per cent of the American selling price, as defined by this act: *Provided*, That no duty, either ad valorem or specific, or both, shall be assessed which amounts to more than 60 per cent of the readjusted value, unless the duties provided by this act when assessed on foreign value would be greater in amount than duties assessed under this paragraph, in which case this paragraph shall not apply."

We believe that this amendment would be fair to all—the workers, the manufacturers, either American or foreign; the importers and distributors, whether they be interested in the distribution of foreign or domestic merchandise, and to the consumers, of which we represent far the greatest number. This amendment could be placed in the administrative features and would not require the changing of any rates.

We respectfully ask that you request the Republican conference or caucus to instruct the Ways and Means Committee to adopt this amendment for the purpose of insuring proper protection to all concerned, whether producers or consumers.

The proposed tariff bill contains many inequalities which, if enacted into law, will be most injurious to hundreds of thousands of American wage earners. We ask your cooperation and support in bringing about the much-needed changes to which we refer.

There are 200,000 Americans employed in the production of American-made shoes, a majority of whom have been unable to obtain steady employment for many months. In many cases their plight is due primarily to the fact that they can not compete with shoes the product of Czechoslovakian labor which produces the same work for less than one-fourth the wages which American workers must receive if we are to maintain the American standards of living. Not only do American shoe workers feel that they have been discriminated against in the proposed law but they are further discriminated against in view of the fact that if the product of their labor is imported into Czechoslovakia a duty is levied of 15 per cent, based on American value.

The committee in its wisdom has seen fit to incorporate in other sections of the bill the following proviso: "*Provided*, That if any country, dependency, province, or other subdivision of government imposes a duty on any article specified in this paragraph, when imported from the United States, an equal duty shall be imposed upon such articles coming into the United States from such country, dependency, province, or other subdivision."

We ask that this provision apply to all imports but especially to imports of boots and shoes.

The printing trades workers, representing an industry employing 300,000 American wage earners, also feel that they have been grossly discriminated against in that under the proposed tariff bill American purchasers of volume printing will find it possible to have their work done with the cheap labor of European countries and import the product of that labor into America, paying less duty than would be levied under the proposed tariff on plain paper. The printing trades use paper as their raw material and it is customary for Congress, as shown in other schedules, namely, cotton, wool, or metals, to levy compensatory rates. Is there any good reason why the printing trades should be discriminated against?

The statistics presented to the Ways and Means Committee by Tariff Commission experts demonstrated the fact that the difference in the cost of production of perfume bottles between American labor and French labor was more than 100 per cent. Yet, the committee recommends a duty of but 65 per cent. The perfume-bottle industry, as pointed out by the Government experts, is a hand industry and the product is purchased only by those who are well able to pay for this product. The workers in this industry receive in wages the benefits which the employers receive through tariff legislation. Should this industry be destroyed?

Americans and Americans alone produce the money with which American churches are presented with marble statuary. The skill of the American marble workers is not excelled by the workers of any country. There are thousands of American marble workers employed in our large cities who are seriously threatened with loss of employment and reduction in their wages by the unfair discrimination practiced against them in permitting the product of foreign workers, produced at a wage cost of less than one-fourth American wages, free entry into America. There surely is no good reason why the marble workers of America should be denied employment and foreign workers benefited.

The proposed tariff bill, looked upon and presumed to be a protective measure, actually places some of the hatters of our country under a further handicap than now exists. Surely this is not the intent of Congress.

The proposed tariff on wearing apparel leaves a differential of only 5 per cent to those American workers who produce finished garments from the cloths purchased in the piece. This surely is discriminatory and should be corrected. Of course, we realize that there may be some Members of Congress who prefer to wear garments imported from foreign countries. Still we believe that even these Members of Congress are fair enough to realize that American workers can not compete with the products of foreign labor receiving but one-fifth of American wages with a protection of only 5 per cent.

We believe in the protective policy, and we ask that this policy be adhered to for the benefit of all American producers rather than for a favored few. We are opposed to special privilege to any group, and we respectfully ask that your support be given to legislation which will protect all American workers, especially the workers employed in these industries wherein the benefit which the employers receive through tariff legislation is passed on to the workers.

Sincerely yours,

MATTHEW WOLL, President.
JAMES MALONEY, Vice President.
CHARLES L. BAINE, Secretary.
I. M. ORNBURN, Treasurer.
M. J. FLYNN, Executive Secretary.

And this brings to mind something I have spoken of before. When we were writing this tariff bill I began thinking about loyalty, patriotism, following the flag, marching behind the band and waving the flag, devotion to country, and so forth, and every day I listened to the evidence that brought to our attention the great increase in foreign imports; and I came to the conclusion that the most patriotic and loyal thing that Mr. or Mrs. American citizen can do is to buy merchandise that is labeled "Made in the United States," [applause] where a

decent pay envelope is delivered every Saturday night for service rendered.

We can do more to help labor, we can do more to serve our country in that way than in any other one way I know of. The term "imported" is a seductive term. You notice the advertisements never say anything in praise or in beautiful language about the American products, but in the most elaborate terms they describe the products of foreign countries, announcing that they have been purchased for your pleasure, your luxury, and your joy. More especially the women want to wear something that is imported. But we have a few Anglophobes among the men who think that they are not dressed unless they wear an English camel's-hair coat and English broadcloth shirts. The sooner we get down to earth and realize that we had better buy merchandise made by our own people the better industry and labor will be off in the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROWTHER. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. What proportion of purchases made by the Army and Navy are made of foreign products?

Mr. CROWTHER. In my opinion there are too many purchases made by the United States Government of foreign products. I believe that we have a law pending to check it; and I hope when we get into the next session we shall make it mandatory that the only bids to be submitted for merchandise to be purchased by the Army and Navy shall be bids which supply goods made in the United States.

Mr. GARNER. Who is the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy of the United States?

Mr. CROWTHER. The President of the United States.

Mr. GARNER. Can not he direct how these purchases shall be made?

Mr. CROWTHER. I think he can, and will. But we can see to it that it is provided for by law. We can do it if we have the "intestinal fortitude." That is what we need in the passage of this tariff bill if we want to do the right thing. Let us realize that there are all classes of people to be considered under this legislation, the men and women who work in the shops, the men who work in the field and till the soil.

The one best thing we can do for America is to keep our folks employed at a decent wage and thus invest them with the power of purchase. Give the average American workman a regularly delivered, well-filled pay envelope, and he will buy everything that he can for the comfort, education, and advancement of his family's happiness. Economy is all right in its place, but what would happen to industry if we had no spenders?

Let us not close this special session without making an earnest, honest effort to have this bill come just as near giving agriculture and industry their full measure of protection. [Applause.]

We have been talking about it for a long time and various methods have been suggested. We now have a chance to do something. Do not let the opportunity fly away and then howl about it afterwards. Before I finish I want to say a word about pottery. Let me tell you about that industry in this country. If the pottery industry in this country were running at full speed, they could supply only 75 per cent of the needs of the country. That leaves 25 per cent for the import trade.

During the last three or four years they have run at only about 60 per cent capacity, so you can see the big gap that has been filled by imports during that period. Of course, there are many things that enter into this question. Invention and new business methods and new kinds of construction and the great science of chemistry cause complete industrial revolutions in this country every two or three years. In three years our method of production of a single commodity may be entirely obsolete, some new process taking its place. Something has happened in the pottery business. They have the so-called tunnel kilns, which have greatly reduced the production costs, and many of the plants without these modern devices are at a material disadvantage. The question arises as to whether we should endeavor to cure these conditions by raising duties. The pottery industry as a whole needs protection, and we have helped them in this bill. I am not certain that we have given them enough, but at least we have given them more than they had in the present act.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROWTHER. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. Will not the gentleman tell the House that this is one place where protection fails to protect? The tariff absolutely fails to afford them protection, and we must find some new method, some way of valuing imports, not taking the valuation from some foreign country, but we must find our own value here.

Mr. CROWTHER. We have helped some in that. Of course, I would like to have seen the American valuation system adopted. It has worked splendidly. I asked Mr. Mills, the Undersecretary of the Treasury, during the hearings how the American selling price had worked in paragraphs 27 and 28 of the chemical schedule, and he referred me to Mr. Camp, and Mr. Camp said, "Very satisfactorily."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. CROWTHER. So that if it was applicable to the chemical schedule it seems to me it might have been well applied to the rest of the bill. However, we now have a situation in 315, where the burden is put upon the importer to show the valuation or his foreign costs, and if he does not do so, then the Treasury Department immediately applies arbitrarily the United States value. That is something of an improvement over the old method. Of course, it is very difficult to obtain foreign production costs. France has set her face against the introduction of any of our agents into her factories in order to get that information. It is a matter that has created an international disturbance between this country and France.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And is it not a fact that the foreign costs differ in different countries?

Mr. CROWTHER. Oh, yes; that is true, and because we have certain treaties it matters not who writes the tariff bill, the low cost production country always has a material advantage in coming into the United States, because the same rate must be assessed against all countries and, of course, Japanese production is a great deal lower than British, French, or German production, yet the same duty must apply under our laws to all these countries.

Mr. BURTNESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROWTHER. Certainly.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman tell us what relief he believes will be obtained in the administration of the flexible provisions of the act? Will it still be necessary to wait two or three years before the preliminary report can be made by the commission upon which the public hearing is held and, of course, the hearing must be held before any recommendation can be made? Is the gentleman hopeful that it may be cut down to something that might appear to us more reasonable?

Mr. CROWTHER. I have no authority, of course, to speak for the President, but I think that it is the President's hope and desire that the Tariff Commission may be so constituted and speeded up and with this new method of not depending on obtaining foreign valuation but arbitrarily using the United States value that we shall be able to get 60 to 90 day decisions in matters of this kind. [Applause.]

Mr. BURTNESS. I refer simply to the effect of the changed provisions in the act before the duty may be raised or lowered or before the recommendation of the committee to raise or lower the duty and not to the matter of valuation.

Mr. CROWTHER. I think the whole procedure, of course, will necessarily be speeded up, and very quick decisions made on preliminary matters that are submitted to the tariff commission.

Mr. BURTNESS. To be more specific, the gentleman feels that it will be easier to determine the difference in competition provided for in this act than to determine abroad the cost of production as required under the Fordney-McCumber Act.

Mr. CROWTHER. Absolutely. I have always been of that opinion, and I have felt for years it was not necessary for us to stick our noses into other people's business and try to get that information abroad. If you are a manufacturer in this country and I am an importer and I am importing the same kind of goods that you are manufacturing, you are not at all concerned as to the production cost of that merchandise in the country of origin, but you are vastly concerned as a business man about what it costs CROWTHER to land those goods on the dock in New York with freight, insurance, and tariff paid.

That is the important thing to you. If we want information as to wages in foreign countries, we can get that from such documents as they publish in their labor departments just the same as we publish them here. It is not necessary for us to have that information. I trust that the President will be successful in speeding up action by the Tariff Commission.

You remember how everybody scoffed at the 37½-cent raise on pig iron? They said pig iron had no difficulty. I heard Democrats speak of it in the last campaign. They said the Steel Trust just went down to Washington and got it for the asking. As a matter of fact, it took over four years to get action by the commission.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that we shall be able to agree as to suggested changes in this bill and do full justice to American industry and agriculture. I predict that the Hawley-Smoot bill will prove as beneficial to the continued prosperity and development of this great Nation as has all previous Republican legislation of this character. [Applause.]

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LOZIER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the gentleman who has so ably and in so interesting a manner addressed the committee [Mr. CROWTHER] made some references to the Democratic Party being a free-trade party. May I say to the members of this committee that it has become quite common in recent years, when the Republicans are unable to defend the unconscionable high tariff schedules, to charge the Democratic Party with being a free-trade party.

I want to say that no man who has even a speaking acquaintance with the political and economic history of this Nation can consistently and truthfully say that there has ever been any free-trade party in the United States.

For more than 40 years I have tried to be reasonably familiar with public and political events. I have never known in America in that long experience but one out-and-out free trader of national repute, in Congress, and that was Frank Hurd, of Ohio, who 30 or 40 years ago advocated the abolition of all customs offices.

May I say to the distinguished gentleman from New York that the division and cleavage between the Republican and Democratic Parties is not along free trade and protective lines. William R. Morrison was not a free trader. John G. Carlisle, that brilliant, profound intellectual statesman from Kentucky, was not a free trader. Sunset Cox was not a free trader. Roger Q. Mills, the author of the Mills bill, was not a free trader. The Democratic Party has never placed in a commanding position of influence and power in this or in the other body at the other end of the Capitol a man who was committed to the doctrine of free trade.

As a matter of fact, my friends, from the very beginning of our Government the cleavage between the Democratic and Republican Parties has been along the line of how far tariff schedules should be advanced in order to raise revenue and afford direct or incidental protection to the manufacturing industries of this country; and the first tariff bill ever enacted, that of 1789, in its title proposed the raising of revenue and the encouragement of American industry. And let me say to the gentleman from New York that the lowest average tariff during the history of this Nation was under the Walker tariff, from 1846 to 1857, when the average duty was 25 per cent ad valorem. Then this tariff produced so much surplus revenue that from 1858 to 1861 the average duty was reduced to 20 per cent. In other words, during the long period that this Nation was under the Walker tariff the average ad valorem duty was 25 per cent, only 12 per cent more than the average duty under the Fordney-McCumber Act, and only 6 per cent less than under the Morrill Act passed in 1861 by the Republican Party when our Nation was on the verge of the greatest intestine struggle in tide of time.

For the benefit of the gentleman from New York and his party associates, may I say that the act of 1789 carried an average duty of 8 per cent? The act of 1812 carried an average duty of 16 per cent, but the war with England came on and that law was not operative, because practically all imports were suspended until we won the war and established our rights to the freedom of the seas. The average ad valorem rate under the act of 1816 was 25 per cent. The act of 1818 to 1824 carried a slight increase over the 1816 rate. The act passed in 1824 carried an average rate of 38.46 per cent, which was just 1 per cent in excess of the average rate under the Fordney-McCumber Act.

When the act of 1824 was pending in Congress, Daniel Webster vigorously opposed the proposed rates on the ground that they were unreasonably and indefensibly high. Strange as it may appear, when the act of 1824 was being considered John C. Calhoun was one of the most aggressive supporters of this measure and the protective system. Calhoun a few years later bitterly regretted the support he had given to that bill. In 1828 Mr. Webster vigorously championed the protective-tariff system, although he had opposed high tariff rates in 1824. On the other hand, Mr. Calhoun, who wholeheartedly supported the high tariff act of 1824, vigorously opposed the high rates carried in the act of 1828. Mr. Webster began as an advocate of a fair tariff but soon became a champion of high protective and almost prohibitory tariff rates. Mr. Calhoun first

favored high tariff schedules but soon became a dauntless opponent of the protective system. This right-about-face attitude of these two great intellectual giants on the tariff question has a counterpart in the lives of William E. Gladstone and Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield. Disraeli in the beginning of his public life was an ardent Liberal but soon became an ultra-Conservative. Gladstone early in life was a hard-boiled Conservative, so much so that some one, I believe it was Lord Macaulay, referred to Gladstone as "the rising hope of the stern and unbending Tories." But Gladstone soon became an ultraradical or Liberal, and these two in after life viciously assailed the policies and principles to which they were devoted in their early political careers. So Webster and Calhoun changed sides on the tariff question, which was no doubt influenced in part by the economic interests of their respective constituents.

From 1829 to 1833 the average rate was 39.956 per cent. From 1834 to 1842 the average was 31 per cent. From 1843 to 1846 the average was 31 per cent. From 1847 to 1857 the average was 25½ per cent. From 1858 to 1861 the average was 20.556 per cent.

Even before Mr. Jefferson became President in 1801 he and his Democratic associates dominated the lawmaking branch of our Government and impressed their economic views on the tariff laws and, with the exception of a few brief intervals between 1801 and 1861, the Democratic Party was in complete control of our national affairs, and by wise and constructive statesmanship impressed its policies and principles on our institutions. The Democratic Party for the 60 years preceding the Civil War, except for a few years, controlled the Presidency and Congress, and these tariff laws from 1801 down to 1861 were almost invariably written by Democratic Congresses and sanctioned by Democratic Presidents. Not one of them was a free-trade measure. Not one of them was unjust to the industrial classes. Not one of them was unfair to labor.

Now, what happened in 1861? Remember that from 1858 to 1861 the average rate was 20.556 per cent. In 1861 the Republicans enacted the Morrill tariff bill, under which the average ad valorem rate was 31 per cent, but slightly higher than the rate under the Democratic tariff of 1846. In 1864, under the stress and strain of the great Civil War, the average tariff rate was increased to 47 per cent. That rate was only about 8 per cent above the average rate under the tariff acts of 1824 and 1828.

From 1872 to 1883 the rate was reduced to 42 per cent. From 1884 to 1890 the average rate was 43 per cent. From 1891 to 1894, under the McKinley Act, the rates were raised to 48 per cent. From 1895 to 1897 to 41 per cent. From 1898 to 1909 the rate was 47 per cent, 10 per cent higher than the schedules carried in the Fordney-McCumber Act. In 1909 the Payne-Aldrich Act fixed the rates at 41 per cent. From 1914 to 1922, under the Underwood Act, the average rate was 26 per cent. You call the Democratic Party a free-trade party, although under the Underwood Tariff Act the average rate of duty was only 11 per cent less than the rates carried by the Fordney-McCumber bill. A party that grants the manufacturers an average tariff protection of 26 per cent can not truthfully be called a free-trade party. From 1922 to 1928, under the Fordney-McCumber Act, the average rate has been 37.67 per cent, although a much higher rate has prevailed on many of the supplies that the common people need and must buy extensively.

I submit the following table that shows at a glance the average ad valorem rate of duty on dutiable imports under major tariff acts from 1789 to 1928:

Act of—	Per cent
1789	8.000
1812	16.000
1816	25.000
1818-1824	(¹)
Period:	
1824-1828	38.468
1829-1833	39.956
1834-1842	31.114
1843-1846	31.220
1847-1857	25.515
1858-1860	20.556
1861-1864	31.088
1865-1871	47.104
1872-1883	42.106
1884-1890	43.589
1891-1894	48.629
1895-1897	41.290
1898-1909	47.115
1910-1913	40.728
1914-1922	26.970
1923-1928	37.670

¹ Slight increase over 1816 rate.

All of these bills enacted prior to 1861, with possibly one or two exceptions, were enacted by the Democratic Party, and those that were enacted while the Democratic Party was temporarily out of power were, nevertheless, passed with the active aid of Democrats, and practically all of them embodied well-recognized Democratic policies; and no man, Democrat or Republican, who is sincere and has any respect for his conscience or truth, will say that a single one of these tariff bills was a free-trade measure.

It is an easy matter for a man who is a narrow partisan and who has no very great regard for truth to get up on his hind legs and charge the Democratic Party with being a free-trade party. Any man who has any familiarity with the political and economic history of this Nation knows that the Democratic Party has never been committed to free trade, but has stood for a fair tariff; it has stood for an equitable tariff; it has advocated a tariff entirely adequate to encourage and amply protect manufactures, but behind which monopolies would not be sheltered; it has advocated tariffs which recognize the differences between the cost of production in Europe and in foreign nations. But during its long and useful history, while dealing fairly with the industrial classes it has opposed the greed, avarice, and unreasonable demands of those who are not satisfied with a fair degree of protection, and who cynically seek to use our tariff laws as agencies and instrumentalities by which they may plunder the public. I say to the manufacturing classes, I will go along with you as far as is necessary to go in order to protect American industry from ruinous competition from abroad. I am willing to give you whatever is right and reasonable in tariff rates. I am willing, when there is a question as to how far we should go in raising or maintaining tariff rates, to give you the benefit of the doubt. But I am not willing to agree to your unreasonable demands or grant you tariff rates so high as to shock the conscience of the Nation, and which will enable you to extract untold millions of dollars from the pockets of the American people.

I am going to submit a detailed statement of the tariff laws that have been enacted since our Federal Constitution was adopted. I am sure a review of our tariff legislation will help our Members to understand and better appreciate the problems that are involved in the pending bill.

Our first tariff law was enacted in 1789. It carried an average ad valorem rate of duty of 8 per cent. Our first tariff law, passed in 1789, in section 1 stated, as one of its purposes, "the encouragement and protection of manufactures." This language also appears in the preamble of the act of 1790. In the debate on this bill James Madison favored an average rate of 5 per cent, which proposal was supported by South Carolina and Georgia. The Pennsylvania Republicans demanded an average rate of 12 per cent. The New England and Virginia Representatives advocated a rate higher than that demanded by the South and a little lower than that advocated by the chief manufacturing States. Times were very prosperous following the enactment of this measure.

In 1812 the tariff rates were doubled, but all importations ceased as a result of our war with Great Britain. Hard times followed, with many bank failures and so much suffering in the New England States that secession was threatened.

In 1816 the first protective tariff was adopted, carrying an average ad valorem rate of 25 per cent. In some respects it was higher than that of 1812, but in other particulars lower, but this act was framed upon the principle of protection, which policy was advocated by John C. Calhoun, who soon bitterly regretted his action. The act of 1816 was followed by great depression in trade.

The 1818 tariff act was modeled along protective lines and the year following its enactment was one of economic distress throughout the Nation.

In 1824 tariff duties were again raised. Daniel Webster at that time opposed the protective-tariff principle. Great depression followed the enactment of this measure and there was no increase in wages.

The act of 1828 was called the "Tariff of Abominations." Those who opposed the measure tried to defeat it by loading it down with abominations, but, to their great surprise, it was enacted with all of its sins and shortcomings. It embodied the recommendations of the National Conference of Manufacturers, held at Harrisburg, Pa. It carried an average ad valorem rate of 41 per cent. It was favored by Mr. Webster, who reversed himself on the tariff question, having vigorously opposed the protective act of 1824. This measure was enacted over the vigorous protest of the representatives of South Carolina, North Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and possibly some other States, which denied the power of Congress to formulate tariff legisla-

tion based on the protective system. This act almost involved us in civil war.

The act of 1832 made a slight reduction in tariff rates, but still retained the protective principle.

The act of 1833 was a compromise measure introduced by Henry Clay and vigorously supported by John C. Calhoun. It provided for a gradual or horizontal reduction of duties until 1842, but the rates were still so high that a large surplus accumulated in the United States Treasury, which was distributed among the States in 1837. A wild speculation in land all over the country resulted largely from the use of these surplus funds and ended in the panic of 1837.

In 1842 the Whigs controlled Congress and passed the tariff act formulated on protective lines, which was followed by one of the greatest business depressions ever known in our history. While this tariff was in force wages were reduced one-half from what they had been even following the panic of 1837. Cotton, corn, wheat, and other commodities sold at such low prices as to drive many farmers and planters into bankruptcy, while owners of iron, cotton, and woolen mills enjoyed fat profits and good times.

The so-called Walker tariff was enacted in 1846. It passed the House by a vote of 114 to 95 and the Senate by the deciding vote of Vice President Dallas. It imposed an average rate of ad valorem duties of 25 per cent. This act was in effect until 1857. This was one of the most prosperous periods in our economic history. John G. Blaine, a high priest of the Republican Party, in his volume entitled "Thirty Years of Congress," had to say about our national prosperity under the so-called Walker tariff of 1846:

The tariff of 1846 was yielding abundant revenue and the business of the country was in a flourishing condition. Money became abundant after the year 1849; large enterprises were undertaken, speculation was prevalent, and for a considerable period the prosperity of the country was general and apparently genuine. After 1852 the Democrats had almost undisputed control of the Government and had gradually become a free-trade party. The principle involved in the tariff of 1846 seemed for the time to be so entirely vindicated and approved that resistance to it ceased not only among the people but among the protective economists and even among the manufacturers to a large extent. So general was this acquiescence that in 1856 a protective tariff was not suggested or even hinted at by any of the three parties which presented presidential candidates.

I may add that while this tariff reduced the duties by about one-third to one-half, there was an immediate and immense increase in commerce, shipping, and business enterprise. Manufacturing flourished. The agricultural classes enjoyed unprecedented prosperity, while wages in all avocations were high and the laboring classes never more prosperous.

The act of 1857 went into effect July 1 of that year. The low tariff of 1846 afforded abundant revenue, and in 1857 a large surplus had accumulated in the United States Treasury. To reduce this surplus, the tariff act of 1857 lowered the average ad valorem rate of duties to 20 per cent. In the following September a short panic occurred as a result of another wild speculation in land, combined partially with the failure of corporations. This panic was of short duration and by 1858 its effect had passed away. During 1859 and 1860 agriculture, commerce, and manufactures were probably more prosperous than they had ever been before. The war came on and in 1861 the Morrill Tariff Act was passed. This measure was avowedly protective, though the primary purpose of its enactment was to raise revenue to carry on the Civil War, but from 1861 to 1864 it only carried an average ad valorem rate of duty of 31 per cent during that period of national distress when every available resource of the American people was being utilized to preserve our Government. It is significant that the Republican Party only thought it necessary to levy an average tariff tax of 31 per cent, which is much less than the average ad valorem rates in tariff bills enacted since the Civil War, and, in fact, less than the average ad valorem rate carried by the pending bill.

The act of June 29, 1861, increased all tariff rates 50 per cent. Further increases were made by the act of June 30, 1864. During the Civil War, and while these high protective tariffs were in force, manufacturers made immense fortunes, and while wages were paid in depreciated paper money they were lower than ever when measured in gold.

The act of 1867 made further increases in the tariff rates, notwithstanding which, the years of 1867, 1868, and 1869 were periods of depression in business, and especially in manufactures. In 1868 the protectionists admitted that there were more idle workmen than had ever been known before.

The act of July 14, 1870, is entitled "An act to reduce internal taxes, and for other purposes." Slight reductions were made in the tariff schedules, but more radical reductions in internal revenues or excise taxes. The tariff of 1870 was essentially protective, and while it was operating the great panic and depression of 1873 occurred. It was much worse than the panic of 1857 and lasted five times as long. Between September, 1873, and January, 1879, great economic distress prevailed throughout the Nation. More laborers were thrown out of employment and idle than in any period of our history. This depression extended to all lines of business. Wages rapidly declined and jobs were at a premium. From 1865 to 1871 the average ad valorem rate of duty was 47 per cent; from 1872 to 1883, 42 per cent.

The act of 1872 made no substantial reductions in duties, although it is entitled "An act to reduce duties on imports and to reduce internal taxes, and for other purposes."

In 1882 a tariff commission was appointed to visit different sections of the country, examine our entire tariff structure, and recommend such changes as were deemed advisable. It recommended a reduction in the average ad valorem rate of duty of 20 per cent.

Following the report of this tariff commission the Republican Party pretended to reduce the tariff rates, but while this act lowered some duties, it raised the duty on other commodities, and as a whole really increased them. The average ad valorem rate of duty between 1884 and 1890 was over 43 per cent. During this period wages of factory and mine workers were materially reduced, workmen thrown out of employment, and the agricultural classes impoverished. Then came the panic of May, 1884, followed by two years of serious business depression. During the great business depression, extending from 1873 to 1879, for the first time legislation against "tramps" became necessary. It was not a period of prosperity but one of acute economic distress. No one prospered during this period except the beneficiaries of high tariff laws, and they did not divide their profits with their workmen. During this period of high tariffs agriculture was broken on the rock of insolvency.

In 1890 the Republican Congress passed what is known as the McKinley Act, under which the average ad valorem rate of duty was 48.629 per cent.

The act of 1895, known as the Wilson-Gorman Act, became a law without the signature of President Cleveland. It reduced the average rate of duty to 41 per cent.

In 1897 the Dingley bill was enacted. It carried an average ad valorem rate of duty in excess of 47 per cent. While it enriched the manufacturers, there was great depression among the laboring and agricultural classes.

The Payne-Aldrich Act was passed in 1909, and from 1910 to 1913 it carried an average ad valorem rate duty of more than 40 per cent. Many of the schedules in this bill were so outrageously and unreasonably excessive that its passage created nation-wide distress and resulted in the great schism of 1912, which split the Republican Party in twain and restored the Democratic Party to power.

Then came the Underwood tariff enacted in 1913, under which the average ad valorem rate of duties, from 1914 to 1922, was reduced to 27 per cent.

The Fordney-McCumber tariff, passed in 1922, carried an average ad valorem rate of duty of 37.67 per cent, five times the average under the first tariff bill enacted by Congress and 20 per cent higher than the rates that prevailed during the stress and storm of our great Civil War. The Senate added 2,500 amendments to this bill.

This act has enriched the manufacturing classes beyond the dreams of avarice. In many cases the rates are so high that they amount to a subsidy, and the pending bill proposes to substantially increase these schedules that are already unquestionably high and indefensible. The Fordney-McCumber Act was dictated by the American manufacturers, and the pending bill was written in compliance with their greedy demands. This bill, if enacted, will tremendously increase the cost of living and place on the backs of the common people an unbearable burden. It will increase the spread between what the farmer gets for his commodities and what he pays for his supplies. It will add hundreds of millions of dollars to the profits of the industrial classes and not increase the wages of the laboring man a penny. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

A TARIFF ON STAPLE COTTON

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the growers of long-staple cotton appeared before the Ways and Means Committee

and requested a reasonable tariff on long-staple cotton. It is now on the free list. Their request has been denied. This is another evidence of the rank discrimination in favor of manufacturers and against agriculture. The producers of both the South and the Southwest argued for a tariff on staple cotton. Briefs were filed. The suggestions of the committee in filing the briefs were heeded. The committee had requested that all arguments present the importance, development, future prospects, and the number of laborers affected. The committee had requested information as to production costs and a comparable cost with wages in foreign countries. The matter of domestic and foreign competition was stressed.

The advocates of a tariff on staple cotton relied upon facts and statistics. Importance, costs, and competition were analyzed and stressed.

SUBCOMMITTEES

Raw cotton is now on the free list. Its fate in the pending bill was in the hands of a subcommittee, of which the Hon. RICHARD S. ALDRICH, of Rhode Island, is the chairman. He is the consistent son of a famous father, one of the coauthors of the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act of 1909 that resulted in the retirement of the Republican administration at that time. He is a Representative from Providence, R. I., and he speaks the language of high protection for cotton manufacturing and free raw cotton.

On the other hand, the subcommittee charged with a revision of the schedule on cotton manufactures, had as its chairman the Hon. ALLEN T. TREADWAY, of Massachusetts, the perennial advocate of free raw cotton and the chief spokesman for higher and prohibitive tariffs for cotton manufactures. The distinguished statesman from Massachusetts gave a statement to the press on May 7, 1929, the date that the tariff act was made public. The two high spots of his statement from which I quote are, first, "Raw cotton remains on the free list." The other is, equally as interesting to his New England manufacturers, "Rates of duty are increased on every kind of manufactured cloth. There is also an increase in the finer yarns." The increase in cotton textiles was primarily for the benefit of New England manufacturers. The unprecedented increase on cotton manufactures is for the mills of New England. The increase is justified by the claim that higher standards of living in New England will be promoted. Under the guise of a benefit to labor, the New England manufacturers of cotton fabrics are given a prohibitive tariff. It is nothing more nor less than a special favor. The spokesmen for Rhode Island and Massachusetts manufacturers are free traders when it comes to producers of the raw product and protectionists when it comes to manufacturing. The cotton schedules are the rankest discrimination against the cotton growers of the United States. The millions who toil in the field know that special favors are granted to the manufacturers.

What is the case of the domestic producers of long-staple cotton? Where is the competition? Why is the grower not entitled to the same benefit accorded to the manufacturer? The Republican platform promised the tariff to both; it is given to the one and denied to the other.

IMPORTANCE

Mr. HAWLEY, the distinguished chairman of the committee, emphasized that the value of exports had increased under the Fordney Act. He neglected to say that the chief item was raw cotton. The value of exports in 1928 aggregated \$5,029,682,000. The chief item was raw cotton. Its value was \$920,009,000. It is the determining factor in the world trade of the United States. The total value of the domestic crop in 1928 was approximately \$2,500,000,000. It should be the aim of the country to promote a crop so important in exports, making secure the balance of world trade in favor of the United States.

Who needs protection, the farmer or the manufacturer? What foreign products are finding markets in the United States? Are they agricultural or manufactured? The value of imports will answer the question. The total imports in 1927 aggregated \$4,184,742,000. According to Mr. H. O. P. Hopkins, Acting Director of the Department of Commerce, on May 2, 1929, and I quote: "Total for all general imports of agricultural products 1927, \$3,257,798,000." The ratio is doubtless true for 1928. Four-fifths of the imports are agricultural. During the year 1928, raw cotton of the value of \$42,797,000 was imported.

The real competition is between the domestic and foreign producers.

The United States produces normally about 60 per cent of the world's cotton. At the same time, this country is the largest consumer, exporter, and manufacturer of raw cotton.

The production for the year 1928 is 14,269,313 bales. There are two kinds of domestic cotton, upland and American-Egyptian.

Upland cotton is divided into two classes. Cotton having a staple of $1\frac{1}{8}$ inches or longer is called "long" cotton, while cotton under $1\frac{1}{8}$ inches in length is classed commercially as "short." American-Egyptian cotton is grown in the Salt River Valley of Arizona and in other sections of the Southwest. It embraces lengths with staples under $1\frac{1}{2}$ and $1\frac{3}{4}$ and over.

The production of staple cotton $1\frac{1}{8}$ inches and longer in 1928, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in its report of April 19, 1929, aggregated 632,216 bales, while the production of American-Egyptian cotton was 28,310 bales.

The chief staple in the United States is seven-eighths of an inch. The production, therefore, in 1928, was approximately 700,000 bales of long-staple cotton. This is a fair estimate of the production during the past five years.

Prior to the Seventieth Congress no arrangements were made for the collection of statistics by the Department of Agriculture as to the production of staple cotton in the United States, so that for the first time in 1928 there is a fairly accurate estimate as to the production of staple cotton.

The production of long-staple upland cotton is mainly confined to the Mississippi Delta. The average production for the past 10 years is around 500,000 bales annually. It is probable that the production in other alluvial sections and in New Mexico, Arizona, and California is around 200,000 bales.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Where does the importation of cotton come from?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am coming to that. I have anticipated the gentleman's question.

EGYPTIAN AND PERUVIAN COTTON

About 250,000 bales of Egyptian and Peruvian cotton are imported annually into the United States. Egyptian cotton is divided into two classes, uppers, grown in the upper Nile, and Sakellarides, which ranges from $1\frac{1}{8}$ to $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches and longer. The uppers is $1\frac{3}{8}$ inches in length and shorter, and the Sakellarides is $1\frac{1}{8}$ inches in length and longer. Peruvian cotton will average about $1\frac{1}{8}$ inches in staple, and the imports for the year ending July 31, 1928, were around 23,000 bales, while the imports of the Egyptian cotton for that year were 202,000 bales.

From one-half to two-thirds of the Egyptian imports is used in making tire fabrics. The remainder is largely used in making fine threads.

Both classes of Egyptian cotton are competitors of American staple cotton. The uppers are competitors of Delta staples and other staples of $1\frac{1}{8}$ to $1\frac{3}{8}$ inches in length. The Sakellarides is a competitor of American-Egyptian or Pima cotton, which is as long or longer than the Egyptian Sakellarides.

DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION AND PRODUCTION OF STAPLE COTTON

For a long time we were without data as to domestic consumption and domestic production of staple cotton. We have no accurate data as to the exports of American staple cotton.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics for the crop of 1928-29, as I have stated, shows a domestic production of cotton from $1\frac{1}{8}$ inches and longer of 660,526 bales, and indicates a domestic consumption of approximately 590,000 bales for the past year. The Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, in a letter to me dated February 2, 1929, informed me that he prepared and published an estimate of the cotton consumed in the United States for the season 1927-28. The estimate indicated that of a total of 6,834,063 bales consumed for the year, 537,826 bales were of the upland staple cotton, while 15,137 bales were of the American-Egyptian variety.

AMERICAN PRODUCTION PRACTICALLY SUFFICIENT

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics for the fiscal year ending July 31, 1928, shows a consumption of the longer staple cotton in the United States, as follows:

	Bales
Sakellarides.....	47,000
Peruvian, similar in length.....	2,600
American-Egyptian or Pima.....	15,100
Total.....	64,700

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics shows a total domestic consumption of staples of $1\frac{1}{8}$ inches and longer, including both foreign and domestic growth, during the past season of around 800,000 bales, while the domestic production was approximately 700,000 bales.

IMPORTED STAPLES

Egyptian staples are the principal competitors of domestic staples. Accurate figures as to various imported cotton are not available. According to the Bureau of Domestic and For-

eign Commerce in a report which they furnished me on February 19, 1929, the United States import figures indicate that over 45 per cent of Egyptian imports are $1\frac{1}{8}$ inches and over. At the same time they also advise me that Egyptian export statistics indicate that only about 30 per cent of the cotton exported from Egypt to the United States is of $1\frac{1}{8}$ inches and over, the remainder being from $1\frac{1}{8}$ to $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches.

AMERICAN USE OF EGYPTIAN COTTON

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics estimates that for the fiscal year ending July 31, 1928, the United States consumed 537,826 bales of American staples $1\frac{1}{8}$ inches and longer and 15,137 bales of American-Egyptian cotton. The bureau shows that the United States consumed 217,582 bales of Egyptian cotton and 16,106 bales of Peruvian cotton. In other words, foreign growers supply the American market with practically one-third of its staple cotton.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. GARNER. Suppose the facts showed that the competition in the New England manufactures of textiles was 33½ per cent. Do you not suppose they would increase the rate, or if they did not have any they would put one on?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will answer my colleague by saying that the two subcommittees that passed on a tariff on staple cotton denied to the millions who grow cotton in the South the benefit of the tariff, and at the same time wrote into the schedule on cotton manufactures the highest tariff ever written on cotton manufactures.

Mr. GARNER. The facts in the hearings show that less than 2 per cent of the textiles used in this country are imported and that there is 35 per cent of the imported staple cotton. They did not put a tariff on the 35 per cent competition, but they did cut down the less than 2 per cent coming in.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. By prohibiting it.

Mr. GARNER. Which goes to show that if you had your industry located where it ought to be you would probably get a tariff rate.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have stated that there are no accurate Government statistics as to the amount of domestic staples exported. A careful check has been made and a reliable estimate is that from 70 to 75 per cent of the Mississippi Delta staple cotton has been consumed in the United States, while from 25 to 30 per cent has been exported. Great Britain is the principal foreign country using Delta staples.

THREAD AND AUTOMOBILE TIRES

The representatives of the thread and tire industries opposed a tariff on staple cotton. Both have a tariff. The tariff on thread and the tariffs on other products of the manufacturers who oppose a tariff on staple cotton are increased. The opposition to the proposed tariff is protected. The manufacturer has been protected through the years. I submit that the thread and tire interests are assuming a selfish position. Their attitude is one of special favor. Domestic staples can be substituted for Egyptian staples. Foreign growers supply the American market with practically one-third of its staple cotton. It is a fair conclusion from all of the testimony and statements before the Ways and Means Committee, and it is universally acknowledged in the trade, that Delta staples can be substituted for Egyptian uppers. Egyptian uppers constitute three-fourths of the imports. They are used largely in the manufacture of automobile tires. As a matter of fact, the automobile trade uses short cotton as well as long cotton. The general understanding in the trade is that Delta staples can be substituted in the manufacture of tires.

The premium of Egyptian uppers over American equivalent white staples in New England for the past few years has been 50 points to 400 points, depending upon the production of both American staple and Egyptian cotton. It is significant that in March, 1928, when Egyptian uppers went to above 500 points premium over American white staples, mills began to use Delta staples. I submit that a better argument that American staples, and particularly Delta staples, can be substituted for Egyptian cotton, could not be produced. The manufacturer himself has answered the argument. He has substituted. If the grower is protected by a reasonable tariff, the American market for the American producer will be preserved and the manufacturer will not be injured.

It may be admitted for the sake of argument that while we produced a 14,000,000-bale crop in 1928, 50,000 bales of foreign cotton are needed by the American industries. This is no answer to the contention that the American production should not be promoted. The question is: Will the American grower of staple

cotton be denied the benefits of the tariff for the advantage of those who consume only about 50,000 bales of imported cotton? While there are thousands of employees in the comparatively few mills that use Egyptian cotton, there are millions of Americans toiling in the fields of the South to compete with the cheapest labor in Africa.

Mr. FORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes.

Mr. FORT. The gentleman has said that almost all of this long-staple cotton is used in tire fabric.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In tire fabric; in the manufacture of fine thread and other fine goods and yarns.

Mr. FORT. The tire fabric manufacturers have no protection in this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. They have a tariff of 10 per cent on tires in paragraph 1439 and 25 per cent on automobiles in paragraph 369 of the pending bill.

Mr. FORT. But on the fabric?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; on the fabric also, under paragraph 905 of the Fordney Act, 25 per cent, but the amount of the tariff under the pending bill is doubtful.

Mr. FORT. Under the cotton schedule?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There is a tariff on automobile tires of 10 per cent, and there is a tariff on the thread manufactured from this cotton that comes in competition with domestic staples, and the schedule of the thread and other household fabrics and necessities has been raised to the highest point in the history of the country.

Mr. FORT. I asked the gentleman about the fabric.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I answered the gentleman as to automobile tires and automobiles, but a small proportion of the tire is cotton, and there is a tariff now on the automobile tire. I do not know whether it is effective or not. I am not here to say that. I take it that the tariff would be effective on cotton, because you have asked for and obtained an increase on the tariff on thread, and it is one of the greatest increases made in this bill, thread manufactured from cotton that comes in competition with ours.

Mr. FORT. If the gentleman will refer to page 89 of the committee report, he will find that the decision which previously put a duty on the tire fabric has been removed in the bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The duty as to tire fabrics in the pending bill is somewhat indefinite. The committee does not report that the duty is removed. On page 85 of the report the committee reported that it had decreased the duties on tire fabric, but the changes in paragraph 905 and the language of paragraph 922 indicate an increase of duty to 45 per cent. However, I say that there is a duty in the act of 1922 on automobile tires and tire fabrics manufactured by the interests that protested before the committee against any sort of a tariff on staple cotton. There is a well-known tariff, of course, on thread, and that tariff has been increased to a very considerable degree in the present bill, so that those who oppose a tariff on cotton for which we ask protection are receiving protection under the present law as well as under the pending bill.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Is it the soil or the climatic conditions or the character of the plant that makes the amount of long-staple cotton so small when the amount of the other cotton is so great?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is a pertinent inquiry. Our staple cotton is not altogether a matter of the size of the plant. It is produced only in certain soils, and under present conditions it is hazardous because of the boll weevil ravages of the past 15 years. Manufacturers have always opposed a tariff on staple cotton. You have heard of sea-island cotton. Mr. John C. Clarke and ex-Senator Lippitt and others appeared before the Ways and Means Committee. The testimony showed that while they insisted they could not substitute American-Egyptian cotton for the Egyptian-Sakellarides cotton, Mr. Clarke distinctly stated that the best long cotton that had ever been produced was the sea-island cotton. The production of sea-island cotton has about disappeared. I maintain that when Mr. Clarke and his associates opposed a tariff on staple cotton they were inconsistent; that they are contradicted by their record. It takes a longer growing season, it is more hazardous. There is a great deal more risk now in the growing of staple cotton anywhere in the United States than there was 15 years ago. If there is any agricultural product of which there is a foreign competitor and

that a tariff could protect, I respectfully submit that on the record before the committee and on the facts it is staple cotton. [Applause.] In 1916 we produced, in round numbers, 117,000 bales of sea-island cotton, the finest cotton ever raised in any country. It could have been used for this long Egyptian cotton, 50,000 bales of which we imported last year.

The CHAIRMAN (Mrs. ROGERS). The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes additional.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What did our friends the manufacturers do at the time there was ample sea-island cotton? They imported—and I speak from the record, according to the testimony—last year 50,000 bales of long cotton for thread manufacture and the manufacture of fine fabrics, and in 1916, 350,796 bales of Egyptian cotton, when we were producing twice as much long cotton as they say they now need. When there was absolutely no question about the ability to substitute domestic cotton, the tariff was opposed by the manufacturers, and they have opposed it from that hour to this.

So much for the attitude of the American Government when it comes to safeguarding the interests of the growers of the most important single item in our foreign trade. What about our competitors? I shall not argue as to whether the tariff be effective or not. I tell you that the conflict between the growers, the manufacturers, and the consumers in this country of ours will never be settled until it is settled right and until the tariff is fair and just to agriculture and manufacturing, and supplemented by legislation to make it effective as to agriculture. The tariff must be just to all and it must be made effective to all before the American people will be satisfied. But what about the foreign tariffs?

Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In a moment.

There is a tariff on sugar. We produce about 8 per cent of the domestic consumption. Why should there not be a tariff on staple cotton when we produce substantially enough for domestic consumption?

It is said that only sea island cotton can take the place of Sakellarides, but the manufacturer has always opposed a tariff on cotton. He opposes it on sea-island cotton. On account of the boll weevil, as well as the low price, sea-island cotton has almost disappeared. In 1926 there was a large production—117,559 bales were raised, while in 1927 only 179 bales were produced. The growing of staple cotton is more hazardous and it ought to be encouraged. It takes a longer growing season, and, on account of the ravages of the boll weevil, it is difficult to raise. It was because of the lack of tariff, among other things, that the production of sea-island cotton has disappeared. The manufacturer has always opposed a tariff. In 1916 117,559 bales of sea-island cotton were raised, as I have said. During the same year, as shown by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, there were imported 350,796 bales of Egyptian cotton. In other words, the fine yarn and thread industries had the benefit that year of 117,000 bales of sea-island cotton, while they now use 50,000 bales of Sakellarides. There was enough to substitute sea-island cotton for Egyptian cotton, but the manufacturer wanted free raw cotton.

These Government statistics are a real answer to the contention that there is no substitute for Egyptian cotton.

Moreover, the production of long-staple cotton in the Mississippi Delta is decreasing. It is safer and cheaper to raise short cotton. The present policy is encouraging imports of Egyptian cotton. If pursued it will mean that the American consumer will be dependent upon foreign production for his long-staple cotton. The production of Pima cotton is decreasing. Arizona produced 103,000 bales in 1920. The present production is one-fourth that amount.

Egyptian cotton is depressing the price of staples. It increases the amount of the carry-over. It diverts the uses of staples, where only short cotton ought to be used. It thus depresses the price of short cotton. According to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics for the fiscal year ended July 31, 1928, there was a total carry-over of American and foreign staple cotton of 566,702 bales. The total carry-over of the entire crop was 2,531,702 bales. In other words, the carry-over of staples, approximately 5 per cent of the American production, was 20 per cent of the total carry-over. Is there any wonder that the price of staples is depressed?

Ordinarily staple cotton is worth very much more than short cotton. The premiums have ranged from \$10 to \$50 a bale.

They are depressed. Delta staples for the past season have brought but little more than 2 or 3 cents per pound more than short cotton. According to a bulletin of Reinhart & Co., of Alexandria, Egypt, dated May 23, 1928, the United States imported from September 1, 1927, to May 23, 1928, 135,000 bales of cotton. This is 25 per cent of the normal yield in the Mississippi Delta.

FOREIGN TARIFFS

Other countries producing cotton, and particularly staple cotton, have a tariff on their production. The tariffs as compiled by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce on January 29, 1929, show that Mexico has a tariff of 5.1 cents per pound; Peru, 6.6 cents per pound; Brazil, 7.19 cents per pound; and Egypt, 8 per cent. Since 1916 Egypt has had an embargo on cotton. No cotton can be imported into Egypt.

The Egyptian Government also imposes an export tax of 2½ per cent on all cotton exported. The direct competitor, therefore, of American staple cotton has access to our markets, without contributing in anywise to the costs of our Government, and at the same time the American consumer is paying a part of the costs of the Egyptian Government. Where, oh where, is the equality in the tariff between raw cotton and the manufactured product?

COSTS OF PRODUCTION

With boll weevil, with high labor, with shorter growing seasons, the grower of American staple cotton is unable to compete with foreign cotton. I know of no more ideal product to which the benefits of a tariff can be applied. If the tariff can aid agriculture, it will certainly benefit staple cotton. The costs of labor in Egypt are probably one-fourth what they are in the United States. The committee was furnished with this information. It was advised as to the difference in the cost of production. The distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in his report stated that foreign costs generally are 40 per cent or less than in the United States. They are less in Egypt than they are in the South and Southwest. A report from the American consul at Alexandria, Egypt, Mr. Raymond H. Geist, dated December 22, 1928, stated that the daily rates of agricultural workers were from 30 to 50 cents for men and 15 to 25 cents for women and children in Egypt. The wage rate in the staple areas of the South and Southwest is from \$1.25 to \$2 a day. Again, the American vice consul at Alexandria, Egypt, Mr. Joseph I. Touchette, on September 30, 1927, in submitting a report on the cost of the production of cotton in Egypt, among other things, said:

The pickers, mostly children, are divided into groups of from 10 to 15, with an overseer in charge who does not spare the lash, which he usually carries, if any ripe cotton is left behind by the children.

Cotton pickers in Egypt are paid from 7½ cents to 25 cents per day for picking staple cotton. Labor is the major cost of any product. Is there not competition?

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Do not the same conditions of comparative cost of wages apply to all countries, whether they produce raw or manufactured products? We raise a surplus of certain classes of cotton. Why are the conditions such that our cotton planters can not produce long-staple cotton? Is it in the plant or in the soil?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. A longer growing season is required for staple cotton. There is a smaller yield per acre than short cotton. It requires a more expensive and intensive cultivation. The areas favorable for production of that character of cotton are determined by the soil, and they are restricted largely, or to the sea islands on the coast of Georgia and South Carolina. The area of the staple cotton is restricted largely to the Mississippi Valley in Mississippi, Arkansas, and Louisiana and to the valley of the Colorado River. A serious insect pest which attacks the cotton, the boll weevil, invaded the cotton-growing region from across the Mexican border some 35 years ago, and as a result of the boll weevil the producing season is short, and it is more hazardous to raise long-staple cotton than ever before. Our growers are confronted with that condition.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Would a tariff change that condition at all?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Undoubtedly it would if encouragement were given to its production, to enable the grower to compete with foreign production.

Long-staple cotton has always brought a premium of from \$15 to \$40 a bale over the price of short cotton, and it is worth more. The average staple cotton grown in Mississippi and in

Arkansas, from 1½ to 1¾ inches, is being sold now, as the result of the depression in price, at substantially the price of short cotton, with the result that the market we ought to obtain for short cotton is being depressed by the weight of our better long-staple cotton for which we ought to have a better price.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. I am in sympathy with the gentleman's proposition and I take it that if we put a tariff on cotton, as the gentleman describes it, more of your land would go into long-staple cotton—is that true?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There would be a cultivation of long-staple cotton which would be for the benefit of the whole country, and at the same time the thing that would encourage that benefit would be that the producers would get a price that would be in keeping with the cost of production.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa. And that would take away some of your surplus, would it not?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Undoubtedly.

Mr. GLOVER. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes.

Mr. GLOVER. The gentleman stated a moment ago that we were importing about 250,000 bales of staple cotton every year. I wish the gentleman would give us information showing how greatly that has been increasing in the last few years, if he can.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman will find that I inserted the importations in the hearings, volume 15, page 8438, before the Committee on Ways and Means. In those hearings the importations of cotton for the last 10 years were inserted. Figures were inserted showing the importations of cotton of all kinds, both short and long, as well as the production of cotton in the United States, for the past 10 years. I will answer the question of the gentleman from Iowa by saying this, that the destructive effect of this competition of staple cotton is seen in this statement: We have a carry-over or surplus this year of something like 2,500,000 bales; the domestic production of staple cotton is from 3 to 5 per cent of the total, and yet because of the importations of staple cotton our carry-over of staples is 20 per cent of the aggregate amount of all cotton, both long and short staple.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, those who oppose a tariff on cotton admit that American-Egyptian cotton is entitled to some relief. Opposing a subsidy generally, ex-United States Senator Harry F. Lippitt, before the Committee on Ways and Means, suggested a subsidy. He admitted that the case was made out, but suggested a futile remedy. They oppose a tariff, but have nothing tangible or reasonable to offer in its place to promote the interests of the grower of staple cotton.

Much has been said about a Democratic tariff and a Republican tariff. The object of tariff duties is to build and not destroy trade and commerce. Whatever the political party, the real measure is the difference in the costs of production here and abroad. There should be equality of opportunity for foreign and domestic commerce. I care not what the formula may be. It may be the Republican tariff of equalizing competitive conditions, or it may be the Democratic tariff of equalizing competition.

Parties differ not so much on tariff principles as in the applications. Republican tariffs on the manufactured product are high. Democratic tariffs have undertaken to do equal justice to industry and agriculture.

Who has a better right to be heard in stating the Republican formula for tariff than the late Theodore Roosevelt? He said:

Protection should place the foreign producer and the domestic producer on an equal plane; less is unfair to the domestic producer, and more is unfair to the American consumer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC TARIFFS

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I quote from the Democratic platform of 1928:

Actual difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, with adequate safeguard for the wage of the American laborer, must be the extreme measure of every tariff rate.

Equitable distribution of the benefits and burdens of the tariffs among all.

Again:

Labor has been benefited by collective bargaining and some industries by a tariff. Agriculture must be as effectively aided.

I quote from the Republican platform:

A protective tariff is as vital to American agriculture as it is to American manufacturing. The Republican Party believes that the home market, built up under the protective policy, belongs to the American farmer, and it pledges its support of legislation which will give this market to him to the full extent of his ability to supply it.

Again:

However, we realize that there are certain industries which can not now successfully compete with foreign producers because of lower foreign wages and a lower cost of living abroad, and we pledge the next Republican Congress to an examination, and, where necessary, a revision, of these schedules to the end that American labor in these industries may again command the home market, may maintain its standard of living, and may count upon steady employment in its accustomed field.

Again I quote from the Republican platform:

We favor adequate tariff protection to such of our agricultural products as are affected by foreign competition.

I revert to the Democratic platform to quote:

The Democratic Party has always stood against special privilege and for common equality under the law. It is a fundamental principle of the party that such tariffs as are levied must not discriminate against any industry, class, or section. Therefore we pledge that in its tariff policy the Democratic Party will insist upon equality of treatment between agriculture and other industries.

President Herbert Hoover maintains that the tariff is a major factor in farm relief. He called a special session of Congress to consider these two pieces of legislation at the same. He said in his speech at St. Louis, in November, 1928:

Many factors enter into a solution of the whole problem. One is by the tariff to reserve to the American farmer the American market; to safeguard him from the competition of imports of farm products from countries of lower standards of living.

Adequate tariff is essential if we would assure relief to the farmer. The first and most complete necessity is that the American farmer have the American market. That can be assured to him solely through the protective tariff.

The difference in the cost of Egyptian Sakellarides and American Pima cotton is relatively the difference in the costs of Delta staples and Egyptian uppers. A reasonable tariff would be from 7 to 10 cents per pound. This would not result in an increase in price to the consumer. The tariffs have already been raised on manufactured products. An increase of 7 cents means an increase in the cost of thread per spool of fifty-eight one thousandths of a cent. It would mean an increase of from 6 to 10 cents on an automobile tire.

If American agriculture is to be placed on a basis of economic equality with other industries, if the American market is to be reserved to the American producer, if the Congress of the United States complies with the promise of President Herbert Hoover in calling a special session of Congress, a reasonable tariff on staple cotton will be granted. [Applause.]

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Just between friends, will the gentleman vote for the bill in case the Republicans should put a duty on cotton?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will vote for a tariff bill that will give and make effective to agriculture, including the industry I represent, cotton, as well as other agricultural industries, the same fair protection and benefits that it gives to manufactured articles. [Applause.]

Mr. TILSON. But will the gentleman vote for the bill if a duty is placed on cotton?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will answer my friend the leader of the majority, just between friends, by saying that I prefer to know what the Republican conference is going to do about giving equality of treatment between agriculture and other industries and making the tariff effective on agriculture before I commit myself. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. TILSON] having assumed the chair, Mr. MICHENER, Chair-

man of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2667, had come to no resolution thereon.

MEETINGS OF THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TILSON). For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes to ask the gentleman from Oregon a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARNER. I see in the afternoon papers an Associated Press dispatch to the effect that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HAWLEY], beginning next Tuesday, will consider suggested amendments by the membership of the House. I would like for the gentleman to elaborate on that statement if he will, for the benefit of the membership of the House. Just how does the gentleman propose to hear the Members of the House and when can they be heard commencing Tuesday?

Mr. HAWLEY. The Republican Members, continuing as the committee framing the bill, will meet in the committee room, I think. We have not yet met, but I think that will be done.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman will recall—

Mr. HAWLEY. Just a moment till I finish the statement—in accordance with the practice we followed in 1922, will meet Members of the House who have amendments to propose and will consider them. If they are agreed to, the full committee will be called then to report upon them.

Mr. GARNER. In other words, you are not going to carry out the program you outlined when we had our meeting and reported this bill, which was to the effect that each day, if I recall correctly—and I do not suppose this was in executive session—we would meet in this little room out here, the entire committee, 30 minutes prior to the meeting of the House for the purpose of considering amendments?

Mr. HAWLEY. We expect to do that.

Mr. GARNER. You expect to adhere to that program?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. But in the meantime the Republican members of the committee are going to meet at an earlier hour in the morning for the purpose of hearing suggestions from the membership of the House?

Mr. HAWLEY. We propose to continue the same policy in making up this bill that we have heretofore followed. We will take the preliminary action.

MEXICAN LABORERS IN BEET-SUGAR PRODUCTION

Mr. BOX. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I insert the following statements by representatives of the beet-sugar-producing interests of the United States, made before the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, showing the extent to which they employ and desire to employ Mexican labor in the production of beet sugar. The Louisiana producers of cane sugar have made no requests for the importation of such labor. The Hawaii sugar-producing interests urged the committee to report a measure authorizing the importation into Hawaii of 40,000 to 50,000 Chinese coolies, to be employed in the sugar-producing industries there.

On January 30, 1920, Mr. W. B. Mandeville testified:

I represent practically all of the farmers in the beet-growing sections west of the Mississippi River; also, what few there are in the East, and that is—in Indiana and Ohio. (Hearings, p. 210.)

Mr. Box. What companies do you represent in connection with the sugar interests? You were making a statement for them the other day, as I understood it, and are continuing it now.

Mr. MANDEVILLE. Yes, sir; I am continuing it for the sugar companies (p. 212). . . . If it is satisfactory, I would now like just to get the amount of labor we figure we will have to have. . . . And taking the basis of the local labor that there was last year that they had, and which they figure they can get. . . . The American Beet Sugar Co., of Rocky Ford, estimates that in their three plants, their three districts . . . in those three districts they will have to have about 2,000 Mexicans. They employed over 2,000 last year. (Same hearings, p. 230.)

. . . . The Holly Sugar Co. at Swink, Colo. . . . estimate that they will only have to have 600. The same company at Huntington Beach, Colo., estimate that they will have to have 1,300.

The Luther Sugar Co. at Santa Ana, Calif., estimate that they will have to have 600.

The Santa Ana Sugar Co. at Santa Ana, Calif., estimate that they will have to have 1,300.

The Los Alamitos Sugar Co. at Los Alamitos, Calif., estimate that they will only have to have 400.

The Annahein Sugar Co. at Annahein, Colo., estimate that they will have to have from 600 to 800.

The Great Western Sugar Co., of Colorado, Montana, and Wyoming, estimate that they will have to have 5,000; and the Spreckels Sugar Co. estimate that they will have to have 400.

Mr. MANDEVILLE. Yes, sir; that is a total of 14,200, they have estimated, and that is practically just what we have had to have practically every year in these territories when we could have a normal acreage. (Same hearings, p. 231.)

The above and much other testimony like it was given in support of a proposition to suspend the contract labor and head-tax provisions of the immigration law to authorize the admission of the class of labor mentioned. (Same hearings, p. 11.)

In 1926 the House committee was considering measures (H. R. 7559 and H. R. 6741) to restrict Mexican immigration and a proposition to liberalize immigration laws to admit a greater number of alien Mexican laborers, when statements from which the following quotations are taken were made before the committee. (See hearings, January 28, 1926, to February 23, 1926; hearings, pp. 429-751.)

One of the propositions was—

That no change be made in the immigration law that will restrict the flow of common labor between the United States and Mexico, but that such changes should be made as will tend to move the barriers now existing.

Mr. CUMMING. I am a farmer and I represent, first and primarily, an organization of beet growers, a little over 3,000, confined to the land-owners in the territory served by the Great Western Sugar Co. I have credentials here from the Chambers of Commerce of Denver—and each one of the towns that I name has a sugar factory—Longmont, Loveland, Fort Collins, Windsor, Greeley, Eaton, Fort Lupton, Brighton, Fort Morgan, Brush, and Sterling.

The Great Western own and operate 11 sugar factories in that territory and are building a twelfth. (Same hearings, p. 488.)

This association . . . sent a delegate, at our own expense, to the border of Texas, and he interviewed the men who employ labor and others at those points, and he reported that there were 6,000 beet workers that could be procured from that territory for 1926, and the Great Western alone will need over 8,000 workers. (Same hearing, p. 489.)

Mr. E. F. Heckman, labor superintendent American Beet Sugar Co., Denver, Colo.—same hearings, pages 582-583—among other things, said:

The percentage of this labor is divided into approximately 40 per cent white and 60 per cent Mexican.

Mr. C. V. Maddux, of Denver, Colo., labor commissioner for the Great Western Sugar Co., among other things, said:

During the year 1918 the so-called Mexicans, including the Spanish-Americans, worked 14 per cent of the acreage, and in the year 1925 the same class worked 44 per cent of the acreage.

Does that give you the information you want? (Hearings, p. 668.)

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; that is it exactly (p. 668).

Mr. MADDUX. Mr. Chairman, at the caucus mentioned, it developed that 37,300 transients will be needed. From that we deduct 17,300, estimated to be available in all the States, exclusive of Texas. That leaves 20,000 more needed. (Same hearings, p. 673.)

A great many witnesses representing these same interests gave similar testimony at those hearings.

Some of them said that the beet-sugar industry could not exist but for the importation of Mexican labor.

Among those appearing in opposition to the restriction of Mexican immigration and support of a proposition to relax the present laws was Harry A. Austin, secretary, United States Sugar Manufacturers' Association. (Same hearings, p. 678.)

In 1928, during the Seventieth Congress, the propositions before the House Committee was H. R. 6465, and other bills proposing to restrict immigration from Mexico.

A number of witnesses representing the beet-sugar growing and manufacturing interests of many States appeared before the committee in opposition to the restriction of Mexican immigration, on the ground that Mexican labor was needed by sugar-beet farmers and beet-sugar manufacturers.

Among these many witnesses was Harry A. Austin, secretary of the United States Beet Sugar Association, a small part

of whose testimony I quote from page 429 of the hearings, February 21 to April 5, 1928:

Mr. AUSTIN.

The next question: How many beet-sugar factories are there in the United States, and in what States are they located?

There are 102 beet-sugar factories in 17 States, as follows:

California	8
Washington	1
Nevada	1
Montana	3
Wyoming	4
Utah	17
Idaho	9
Colorado	19
Kansas	1
Nebraska	6
Iowa	3
Minnesota	2
South Dakota	1
Wisconsin	6
Michigan	15
Ohio	5
Indiana	1

Mr. AUSTIN. And 35,000 laborers, mechanics, etc., are employed in and around the factories.

Mr. Box. How many farm laborers are there?

Mr. AUSTIN. Well, they estimate from 60,000 to 80,000.

Mr. Box. What per cent of them are Mexicans?

Mr. AUSTIN. The next question, Judge, gives that information. How many farmers growing the sugar beets in 1926-27 did all their handwork on the beet crop?

The answer is about 20 per cent, or, say, 20,000.

Mr. Box. That means the farmer and his family?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; the farmer and his family.

Estimated number of persons who did handwork in 1926-27, acreage exclusive of such work done by farmers and members of farmer's family.

The answer is about 58,000.

Mr. Box. What per cent of them are Mexicans?

Mr. Box. You say 58,000 Americans and Spanish-Americans?

Mr. AUSTIN. No; 58,000 was the number of farm laborers who did the handwork, exclusive of those farmers and their families.

The number of Mexicans who did handwork in 1926-27 was approximately 30,000.

Mr. Box. In the beet-sugar industry?

Mr. AUSTIN. In the beet-sugar industry. Yes; farm labor.

A great many other gentlemen representing the divers beet-sugar producing interests of many States gave many statements of the same general import as those quoted from the hearings of 1920, 1926, and 1928. (See hearings.)

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, May 13, 1929, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

15. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination and survey of Pass Manchac, La., was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAIRD: A bill (H. R. 2854) for the erection of a public building at the city of Norwalk, State of Ohio, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 2855) directing the Secretary of War to issue Army discharges to those who were regularly inducted into the military service of the United States prior to November 11, 1918, and to whom were issued discharges from draft on and after that date; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2856) to amend paragraph 10 of section 202 of the World War veterans' act of 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 2857) to establish a woman's bureau in the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2858) to provide for the acquisition of a residence for the use of the Vice President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RANSLEY: A bill (H. R. 2859) to authorize appropriations for pay of the Military Academy to be disbursed and accounted for as one fund; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER: A bill (H. R. 2860) to authorize the expenditure of \$125,000 to purchase land for, and build an Indian hospital, and to furnish equipment, to be located in Forest County, Wis.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Maryland urging the Congress of the United States that they be earnestly requested to take appropriate action whereby The Star-Spangled Banner may be declared to be the national anthem of the United States of America; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. SIMMONS: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Nebraska, urging the Congress of the United States, now in special session, to introduce and enact into law the provisions of the Robinson bill providing for the payment to the veterans of the Civil War and to their widows the monthly pension therein provided for; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Maryland, memorializing the Congress of the United States to select a site for the summer home of the President in the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Maryland, memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the copyright law; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Maryland, recommending to the Congress of the United States that The Star-Spangled Banner be declared to be the national anthem of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANSLEY: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the Congress of the United States, and especially the United States Senator and Congressmen from Pennsylvania, to use their best offices in an effort to amend the tariff law in a manner that will bring adequate protection to the coal, textile, and art glass industries of Pennsylvania from this very destructive foreign competition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARNOLD: A bill (H. R. 2861) granting a pension to Sarah A. Fortney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRADDOCK: A bill (H. R. 2862) granting a pension to Frank Bryan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2863) for the relief of Harvey O. Willis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2864) granting a pension to Mabel Iller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 2865) granting an increase of pension to James Shaughnessy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS of California: A bill (H. R. 2866) for the relief of Lawrence D. Collins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 2867) granting a pension to Joseph Emminger; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 2868) granting an increase of pension to Mary T. O'Malley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 2869) granting an increase of pension to Elvira A. Easton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HANCOCK: A bill (H. R. 2870) granting an increase of pension to Nora Boyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 2871) granting a pension to Jasper Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2872) granting a pension to A. E. Shaw; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 2873) for the relief of Fred B. Bartsch; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 2874) granting an increase of pension to Mary Conaway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 2875) for the relief of Furman E. Wolfe; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 2876) for the relief of J. C. Peixotto; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOREHEAD: A bill (H. R. 2877) granting a pension to Laura Frankfather; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2878) granting a pension to Mary E. Scovill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2879) granting a pension to Emma B. Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2880) granting a pension to Mary Jane Estep; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2881) granting a pension to Effie Alice Creighton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2882) granting a pension to Frances DuFrane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2883) granting a pension to Jesse Beason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2884) granting a pension to Fred Libbee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2885) granting an increase of pension to Francis H. P. Showalter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 2886) granting a pension to Frank Farmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWANSON: A bill (H. R. 2887) for the relief of Mildred L. Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2888) for the relief of Anthony Wade; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 2889) granting a pension to Emma J. Cruzan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZIEHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 2890) granting an increase of pension to Maria Middleton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2891) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. Maxson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2892) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2893) granting an increase of pension to Ann S. Shaffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

370. By Mr. GARBER of Oklahoma: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of Oklahoma, in regard to further increase in membership of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

371. Also, petition of the tariff committee of the Clear Creek County Metal Mining Association, Idaho Springs, Colo., urging increased protection on products of the western mining industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

372. Also, petition of the National Gas Appliance Manufacturers' Association, indorsing legislation proposed in the Capper-Kelly fair trade bill of the Seventieth Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

373. Also, petition of Exchange National Bank, Ardmore, Okla., signed by Fred C. Carr, president, in support of increased tariff on pecans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

374. Also, petition of Oklahoma Portland Cement Co., Oklahoma City, Okla., in support of bill placing tariff on Portland cement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

375. Also, petition of committee on pig-iron tariff, signed by F. B. Richards, in support of tariff on pig iron; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

376. Also, petition of the American Cotton Manufacturers Association, signed by W. M. McLaurine, secretary and treasurer, against the weaving of duck in the Atlanta Penitentiary; to the Committee on Labor.

377. Also, petition of United States Sugar Association, signed by M. Doran, secretary, in regard to tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

378. Also, miscellaneous statements in support of tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

379. Also, petition of Hershey Corporation, signed by John E. Snyder, in protest against rate proposed on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

380. By Mr. KADING: Resolution by the Wisconsin State Horticultural Society, Madison, Wis., protesting against a tariff on lumber and shingles from Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

381. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of Premier Shoe Co., 808 Driggs Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging that hides and skins remain on free list and that duty be placed on import of shoes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

382. By Mr. QUAYLE: Petition of Lax & Abowitz, 40 Flatbush Avenue, extended, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the enactment of legislation that will protect the shoe industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

383. Also, petition of Mildred Shoe Co., 164 Tillary Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the enactment of legislation that will protect the shoe industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

384. Also, petition of Heim & Doremus (Inc.), 325 Gold Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the enactment of legislation that will protect the shoe industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

385. Also, petition of Big Six Post, No. 1522, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, protesting against the eighteenth amendment and enacting laws and demanding their repeal and the annulment of the Jones law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

386. By Mr. SWANSON: Petition of J. E. Brooks and others, of Greenfield, Iowa, favoring a Federal department of education, with a secretary of education who will be a member of the President's Cabinet; to the Committee on Education.

387. Petition of L. F. Vance, La Crosse, Wis., versus Hon. Walter J. Kohler, governor, and Hon. John W. Reynolds, attorney general; to the Committee on the Judiciary.